DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 644 SO 010 779

AUTHOR Sikkema, Mildred; Niyekawa-Howard, Agnes M.
TITLE Cross-Cultural Learning and Self-Growth: Getting to Know Ourselves and Others.
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. School of Social Work.; International Association of Schools of Social Work, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE 77
GRANT 5-T21-MH12582
NOTE 134p.; Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of small type of document
AVAILABLE FROM International Association of Schools of Social Work, 345 East 46th Street, New York, New York 10017 ($6.00, paper cover, 10% discount for 10 copies or more)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Development; Cross Cultural Studies; *Cross Cultural Training; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Context; *Cultural Differences; Cultural Disadvantagement; Cultural Interrelationships; Culture Contact; Divergent Thinking; Ethnic Stereotypes; Field Experience Programs; Foreign Culture; Higher Education; Intercultural Programs; Learning Experience; Problem Solving; *Project Training Methods; *Self Concept; Social Integration; Social Problems; Social Relations; *Social Work; Social Workers

ABSTRACT

This book reports on a field training project in social work education which emphasized learning to deal with cultural differences. Objectives of the project were to achieve an understanding of another culture and to move toward personal growth by becoming aware of one's cultural and personal biases. The book contains seven chapters. Chapter I introduces the project and discusses the need for cultural awareness. Chapter II examines the theoretical bases of the project, describes the project, and lists its components. Chapter III emphasizes the cognitive learning aspect of the project which included a pre-training seminar and an integration seminar. Chapter IV examines the design of the cultural field experience and gives a detailed account of the stages the two student groups went through in the experiential, cross-cultural learning process. Many examples of the student activities are given. Chapter V summarizes the overall student learning by focusing on the students' perceptions of the project and their personal growth as a result of participating. Chapter VI describes three variations of the original project. The last chapter gives a brief summary of the project, suggests modifications in the design, and discusses some implications for professional education in social work.
(Author/JK)

ED152644

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
George Walmsley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Cross-Cultural Learning & Self-Growth

GETTING TO KNOW OURSELVES AND OTHERS

Mildred Sikkema
Agnes M. Niyekawa-Howard

SW 010 779

A Joint Publication of the
International Association of Schools of Social Work
and the University of Hawaii School of Social Work

© Copyright 1977 by the
International Association of Schools of Social Work
345 East 46th Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

Library of Congress No. 77-71281

This project was supported by Grant No. 5 T21 MH12582, awarded to the School of Social Work, University of Hawaii, by the National Institute of Mental Health, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FOREWORD

> After half a century of exposure to world cultures and politics and of problem-solving, we are culturally more alienated and politically more isolated than at any time in the past and we seem totally unable to solve any of our major problems, foreign or domestic.
>
> Henry Steele Commager
> *Intercultural Education*
> March, 1970

This pessimistic and somewhat overstated pronouncement refers to the United States, but the kernel of truth which lies in Commager's words applies everywhere. International understanding and world brotherhood have made little progress in recent years despite numerous efforts to increase communication and to foster sympathetic tolerance for cultural differences.

Commager would have us return to an earlier traditionalist philosophy of education in order to foster an enlightened view of the world and a sympathetic understanding of other peoples. On the other hand, there are those who say that academic learning alone produces passive rather than active understanding of other peoples and other cultures. Culture shock is said to be essential to the achievement of an active understanding of another culture and this is best achieved through experiential learning that encompasses a sufficiently intensive personal involvement in order to produce fundamental changes in outlook and attitude.

This book documents the use of such an approach in reaching the goal of "active understanding." The social work students who journeyed from the University of Hawaii to Guam to become intimately involved with people of a

different culture declared almost unanimously that the experience was "one of the most if not the most useful" or unqualifiedly "the most useful" learning in the course of their professional training.

The project described in this book proceeded under the educational assumption:

> . . . that a relatively unstructured learning experience in a different culture, preceded by a seminar emphasizing the awareness of one's own culture and broadened perceptions and followed by an integrating seminar, would be likely to have a strong and permanent impact on a student's learning. (p. 17)

The expected outcome was an increase in tolerance, understanding (of oneself and others), sensitivity, divergent thinking, and creativity in solving problems. Certainly, these are characteristics which are desirable in any walk of life, but for social workers they make the difference between an efficient but stereotyped or a creative and flexible response to the infinite variety of people and the wide range of problem situations with which the social work professional must deal.

A particularly significant outcome of the project was the increased comfort in dealing with ambiguous situations that the students later experienced. In the experimental field placement in the midst of another culture, the students soon recognized that they could take nothing for granted. They learned to listen in a new way; they discovered that there were various approaches to the handling of problem situations; because they were jolted out of their usual mode of response, they tapped new potentials within themselves which had a liberating impact on their personal as well as their professional development. Now, more than ever before, social workers everywhere face ambiguities. When faced with difficult and constantly changing situations, any learning which prepares them to cope creatively and with understanding should be encouraged.

The question, of course, is how to fit a cultural learning experience into the academic pattern of a school of social work. There have been a number of efforts in different parts of the world to open up opportunities to social work students for field placements in a "foreign" setting. Few of these attempts have been as systematic as the University of Hawaii project and there has been virtually no assessment of the little that has been done. However, there is no mistaking the interest in or the need for more widespread experimentation with experiential field learning that is designed to develop an appreciation and true acceptance of people who are different from oneself. One does not need to cross an ocean or a national border to find people whose ideas, values, attitudes, and behavior seem different and alien. The many cultures and subcultures within a community, city, or country offer a number of possibilities for experiential cultural learning although the results may not be as uniformly satisfactory as placement in a foreign setting. The authors of the present report, for example, found that the students who were placed on the Hawaiian island of Molokai did not experience the same culture shock that

proved so beneficial to the students in the placement in Guam, but a definite process of becoming more sensitive and aware in interactional situations was still set in motion.

Perhaps what is most needed in planning this kind of experience is an innovative and flexible approach by faculty, with imaginative recognition of what may be available in cultural learning across the town or down the road as well as in another country. For example, urban schools could give consideration to rural placements or vice-versa. Unless we believe (and I would hope that we don't) that only Blacks can work with Blacks, or Orientals with Orientals, migrants with migrant workers, or the poor with the poor, etc., cultural variety should not be hard to find.

The necessity for this kind of learning is now becoming even more marked in those parts of the world where national borders are beginning to lose their significance. In the European Economic Community, for example, more and more stress is being placed on the free movement of professional and many other types of personnel from one country to another. With differences in language as well as in culture, the task of preparing social workers capable of free movement and active understanding of a wide range of differences is formidable indeed, but some schools will need and want to make the effort. The project described here gives them one direction in which to go.

Finally, there is much to be learned from the cross-cultural learning experiment documented in this book which would be of considerable value in work with foreign students. Too often, Third World students, for example, become so Americanized or Europeanized that they do not return home or, if they do, become strangers in their own land. A major purpose of cross-cultural learning is to re-examine and come to an appreciation of one's own culture while learning to evaluate and grasp another culture. Not enough is done to assist foreign students in comparing and understanding the different values and meanings in their culture as compared to those of the new culture. Perhaps too much is done to force them into a conforming mold from which they cannot then extricate themselves.

Cultural learning is not new but it is still comparatively rare in programs of professional education. It is not a panacea or a final answer to the question of how to help students to become non-judgmental and truly accepting of difference, but it has power to move them in that direction. Although there are problems—educational, financial, and organizational—in placing students for field learning in unfamiliar cultural settings, there is enough potential available to most of our schools of social work to warrant serious exploration of this approach.

The International Association of Schools of Social Work is pleased to have this opportunity, in cooperation with the University of Hawaii School of Social Work, to publish *Cross-Cultural Learning and Self-Growth: Getting to Know Ourselves and Others*. It offers a stimulating account of a new dimension in the practical or field training of social workers and will serve as a

guide to all those interested in increasing awareness, appreciation, and acceptance of cultural differences. Its utility is not limited to the field of social work. All helping and human service professions have the same responsibility to help their practitioners to understand themselves and others so that the service and the act of helping remain related to the recipient as a human being, each with his own unique needs and values. It is this approach which, in time, will give life to the concept of world brotherhood and foster a human solidarity that transcends differences of nationality, race, faith, cultural traditions and, perhaps, even of ideologies.

Katherine A. Kendall
Secretary-General
International Association of
Schools of Social Work

December, 1976

PREFACE

This book is unique in that it reports on an actual experiment in cross-cultural learning. The social science literature is rich in studies of specific cultures and even in a number of cross-cultural comparisons, but there is a dearth of information on what it means for a group of Western-trained professionals to try to learn about another culture simply by observing it—not by playing a professional role in it nor doing formal research about it. Such immersion brings to the fore the culture contrasts and the role ambiguities which such Westerners face.

The significance of the book lies in its treatment of a crucial world problem: that is, how people of different cultures can live together in the same national society and how different national societies with varied cultural backgrounds can accommodate and cooperate in an emerging global society, often referred to as the world community. Studies such as this provide insight into the difficulties and the possibilities of dealing with this problem, which will become even more acute in decades ahead.

Another valuable contribution of the book is its distinction between cognitive and affective learning. Far too often we try to get an "intellectual" understanding of another culture by classifying its "traits" into paradigms developed in the West on the assumption that if we have enough traits sorted into enough boxes, we can then arrive at an understanding of the culture being analyzed. This experiment shows the insufficiency of such an exercise if it fails to deal with the emotional content of the culture. The field notes collected by the professionals involved in this experiment bear testimony to the inadequacy of some Western models to explain personal relationships and their meanings. Some of the individuals involved, it would seem, had to divest themselves of Western analytical schemes before they could arrive at

what they experienced as the real content of the new culture. This does not mean that Western paradigms are useless in other settings but that many of them are insufficient and need supplementation with other approaches to social reality. It is a tragedy of our time that many professionals, particularly in agriculture, engineering, public administration, and so forth, who go abroad will not listen to those trying to make them aware of cultural subtleties which affect their performance. It is only after they have encountered cultural obstacles which they did not expect and cannot explain that they are willing to admit that their training in the West did not provide them with all of the answers needed. Humility often comes too late, after much wasted effort and misused resources. One would predict that most of those who benefited from this experiment in cross-cultural learning will carry a greater degree of humility, a greater readiness to learn, into cross-cultural situations.

The practicality of this book also gives it a wide appeal. By comparing three types of cross-cultural learning programs it shows the advantages and disadvantages of each. The approach is experimental and the results are practical in that they can be applied to future efforts. Circumstances forced a common sense methodological approach which may have broader applicability in program terms than would a much more complicated statistical approach in which several variables were carefully controlled. This second approach might have helped one test hypotheses which would have added to social science theory about cross-cultural learning, but the actual experiments described here assist one in devising and evaluating programs in which cross-cultural learning is actually achieved. Furthermore, the experiments were based on a careful analysis of the social science literature and an effort to take such findings into account in the preparation for and conduct of the experiment.

The authors are to be congratulated, not only on the imaginative concept underlying the cross-cultural experiences described but on the systematic way in which they carried out the program in terms of relevant learning theory and the acculturation process. One would hope that this successful endeavor will lead to further efforts in which the other professionals involved will chronicle and later share their experiences with fellow-professionals, thereby providing significant data to deepen our knowledge of both the cognitive and affective aspects of cross-cultural learning.

Irwin T. Sanders
Boston University

December, 1976

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people are part of the project described in this book, and without them there could have been no project. The authors are humble in the face of so much interest, generosity, and patience. The people of Guam and Molokai welcomed the students involved into their homes. They were tolerant of our mistakes; they recognized and accepted our respect and the enjoyment we all found in being part of their lives. They were our teachers; they made a great difference in our lives. For this we are deeply grateful.

We are also grateful for the generous help given to us by the Guam Department of Health and Social Services. Franklin Cruz, then director of the department, gave us the needed sanction and inspired in the members of his staff a sense of interest and support. Mrs. Eloise Carleton, Social Services Advisor, was active in the planning and in making the innumerable arrangements in Guam. Pedro L.G. Santos, Division of Social Services, was especially helpful in discussions with the students. Other administrative staff members gave thoughtful advice in planning the field site and assisted in helping us to make contacts. Many staff members gave time individually to meet the students' needs and to help them become acquainted with the villages. Inevitably, warm and enduring friendships developed.

Mrs. Mieko Crowell, Head Start Program Director, and members of her staff kindly arranged for the students to accompany them on home visits, to visit classes, and to attend Closing Day Programs, so that they might become acquainted with the villages, the children, and their parents. Robert Leon Guerrero, Director, and members of the staff of the Department of Corrections, Judicial Branch, welcomed those students interested in making friends with the young people at Youth Hall. Directors Gallo Camacho and J. Nededog, Coordinator Mrs. Tita Johnson, and members of the staff of the Community Action Agency made special efforts during our entire stay in Guam to assist the students in many ways.

We owe a great debt of thanks to Joachim S. N. Diego, Commissioner of

Inarajan, who publicly welcomed the first group of students in the Guam project, and to his successor, J. P. San Nicholas, who did the same for the second group. Both made it possible for the students to participate in the life of the village. Their warmth, interest, and friendship are deeply valued. We also wish to thank the commissioners in other villages who gave assistance and support to the students.

We acknowledge the generosity of the University of Guam for arranging for the students to live in campus dormitories.

We cannot name all of those from whom we learned so much in informal conversations, who taught us the Guamanian way of sharing, who gave freely of their time, and who provided us with the opportunity to learn the richness of their culture and, in the process, helped us to see our own in perspective.

To Masaru Oshiro, then Executive Director of the Queen Liliuokalani Children's Center (Oahu), we are indebted for giving us sanction on Molokai. We thank Georgeanna Padeken and other members of the staff of the Molokai office of the Center who graciously welcomed the students to Molokai and to the Center, where they often enjoyed evenings of "talking story." The students continue to appreciate the friendships with their families, the Napoleons, and others who helped them to have experiences unique to Molokai and who, with naturalness and warmth, involved the students in their daily family activities.

For help with the Honolulu Program variation, we wish to express our gratitude to the three agencies who selected families of differing ethnic backgrounds and introduced the students to them: Catholic Social Service, Queen Liliuokalani Children's Center, and Susannah Wesley Community Center. We also thank the selected families for including the students in their activities.

A colleague and friend, Dr. Herbert H. Aptekar, then Dean of the School of Social Work, University of Hawaii, gave encouragement and support to the project over a period of several years. At the time of his recent death in New York he was active in arranging correspondence with a mainland school of social work interested in this type of program.

We acknowledge with appreciation and affection the contribution to this book and to the project of our colleague, Robert Masuda of the faculty of the School of Social Work, University of Hawaii, who recognized the implications of the project for curriculum development and who involved himself in all three of its components: pre-training, experiential learning, and integration.

To all the students who participated, who shared the joys and difficulties of an innovative project such as this, we also give our thanks.

We are indebted to Aldyth Morris who edited the manuscript—a labor of interest and friendship; also to Hisae Tachi and Amy Matsuno, for their skill and patience in typing the manuscript.

We are pleased to acknowledge that the entire project, including the publication of this book, was accomplished through the support of the National Institute of Mental Health.—*M.S.*

Table of Contents

	page
Foreword	iii
Preface	vii
Acknowledgments	ix
Chapter I: INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter II: THE PROJECT	10
Theoretical Bases	
Description of the Project	
Chapter III: COGNITIVE LEARNING	21
Pre-Training Seminar	
Integration Seminar	
Chapter IV: EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING	35
Design of the Cultural Field Experience	
The Field Plan	
The Learning Process	
Summary	
Chapter V: OVERALL LEARNING	67
Students' Perceptions of the Project as an Educational Program	
Continuation of the Integration Process	
The Learning	

Chapter VI: VARIATIONS 84

The Molokai Program
The Honolulu Program
The Hong Kong Program

Chapter VII: SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS 105

Recapitulation of the Project
Suggested Modifications in the Design
Implications for Professional Education
in Social Work

Selected Bibliography 118

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

This book is a report of a field training project in social work education which emphasized learning to deal with cultural differences. The project was conducted at the School of Social Work, University of Hawaii.*

Social workers as well as other professionals need to understand the meaning and significance of cultural patterns and cultural differences in the same way they now understand individual differences. Professional educators and practitioners often have a culture-bound view of their subject matter, skills, and techniques or methods and tend to suppose a kind of universality in its "rightness" and its applicability. Thus, an easy transferability from one ethnic, subcultural, or cultural group to another may erroneously be assumed.

Another problem that is frequently overlooked is the failure to recognize the importance of the difference between passive and active understanding. A greater consideration needs to be given by professional educators to the consequences of the lack of active understanding and the meaning of cultural differences as a basis for professional practice.

Today, in this rapidly shrinking world, many of us find ourselves unexpectedly acquiring, say, an Iranian brother-in-law or a Vietnamese daughter-in-law. People from countries occupying an obscure place on our mental maps suddenly appear in the flesh and we experience our first real intercultural encounter. Interacting with a person from another culture in a face-to-face situation, where understanding him and being understood by him are essential, is quite different from observing such a person from a comfortable distance. Such encounters are, however, becoming more and more common in today's world.

---

*One member of the school's faculty was project director and a second faculty member became involved during the third year of the project. The co-author, a social psychologist, was involved in the project throughout.

Despite the large number of individuals—especially those in the helping professions, such as social workers, public administrators, engineers, public health workers, teachers, agriculturalists, psychiatrists, and so on—who come in contact with people of other ethnic and national backgrounds, the number who can interact with them in a meaningful way and without strong chance of misunderstanding is proportionately small. Many consider themselves competent in dealing with "foreigners" without realizing how little they understand the situation.

A professor with years of teaching experience abroad once said, "When I advise a foreign student who had just arrived, I test his English by telling him a joke. If he doesn't laugh, I know he needs English classes before he can enroll in any of the regular academic courses." He did not seem to realize that understanding an American joke requires familiarity with American culture as well as language, nor did he take into account the fact that people of different cultures may not laugh about the same things. What people from one culture may consider funny may be perceived by people of another culture or subculture as poor taste. Furthermore, a graduate student in chemistry or mathematics, for example, probably can follow a lecture in his own field because he is familiar with the subject matter even though he does not understand American jokes or cannot speak English fluently.

We assume that people of another culture or subculture see, feel, and think as we do. It is true that certain basic emotions, such as joy and sorrow, are common to all cultures, but the ways of expressing these feelings may not be the same. Much misunderstanding is caused by the assumption that our own reactions are universal.

The reason for the surprising lack of awareness of the need for deeper cross-cultural understanding may be that the majority of well-educated people have a "passive" understanding of different cultures and subcultures that gives them the feeling that they know the other cultures. Traveling to many foreign countries, meeting and interacting with foreign representatives at conferences and banquets, and having a few acquaintances from other countries or other ethnic groups are, however, no guarantee that a person can function well in intercultural settings.

Literary translations and foreign movies reveal a great deal of commonality across cultures. Themes of love, conflict, suffering, and happiness can be shared, and one has no problem in identifying with heroes and heroines, even though they are dressed in different clothes and are speaking different languages. Actually, the ease with which we understand the characters, no matter how alien the setting, adds to a false sense of knowing and understanding.

We have been speaking thus far of "passive" understanding; however, when people of different cultures or subcultures interact in face-to-face situations in which egos are involved, another kind of understanding is required—"active" understanding. Passive understanding can be attained without ever leaving one's home town. It can be achieved to a significant extent by studying the literature, philosophy, religion, history, or art of a particular culture. At a

time when international cooperation is essential for survival, learning to see people of other cultures as more similar to us than different is essential. The efforts of those who work for this type of intercultural education must be appreciated. For those who will be interacting with real people of flesh and blood, particularly on their own home ground or in situations typically encountered in the helping professions where more than superficial communication is required, such passive understanding is far from sufficient.

A familiar experience will illustrate the difference between passive and active understanding. Many of us have developed special attachments and identifications with particular groups of people through their literature, history, or art. Casual contacts with a high school or college classmate from Argentina may stimulate a strong interest in that country. Learning French or German in high school may have a similar effect. The romantic love and admiration we may have developed for an exotic culture and people may evaporate, however, when we eventually come into non-superficial contact with these people. An innocent, well-intentioned comment or action may provoke a totally unexpected reaction. In certain cultures, for instance, asking a man about the health of his mother or sister is tantamount to accusing him of intimate knowledge of her and may lead to an extremely hostile response, embarrassment, and/or hurt feelings, even to the breaking off of the relationship.

Such a minor and, to you, completely normal thing as a joke intended to relax tension may be taken as an insult. You behave in a way acceptable in your own culture; you are eager to make friends with these new people but they begin to withdraw and you do not know why. You may attempt to explain that you meant no harm; you may apologize and ask what you did that was wrong, but even that may not restore the relationship. In one instance, an American girl cleaned the room while her Thai roommate was having breakfast in the dormitory dining hall. When the roommate returned, she became upset, cried, and left the room. Later it became clear that the American girl had placed the Thai girl's skirt on the pillow portion of the bed. In the Thai culture, the head is sacred and putting a piece of clothing associated with a lesser part of the body on a place reserved for the head was one of the worst possible insults. Friends and advisors tried to explain to the Thai girl that the American girl's intentions were only good, but the involuntary reaction was so deep that she refused to room with the American girl again. It is hardly necessary to point out that the situation could have happened in reverse: the Thai girl's best intentions might have offended the American girl's sensibilities.

The essential difference between passive and active understanding lies in intellectual and rational understanding on the one hand and affective understanding on the other. It is much easier to understand and accept cultural differences at the rational level than at the emotional level. These reactions are not usually under conscious control.

Most of us have gone through the experience of being convinced at the rational level that the foreign food our host is serving should be tried, yet feel-

ing at the emotional level such anxiety and discomfort that it shows in physical reactions to the food. It may be just a frown or an intonation, or it may extend to such bodily reactions as restlessness, constipation, or a vomit reflex. It is this type of reaction that is relevant to active understanding: it is at this level that the ego is involved.

Active understanding requires the development at gut-level of an attitude of acceptance, respect, and tolerance of cultural differences. This can hardly be accomplished through traditional classroom methods, because learning in the classroom situation is handled primarily at the intellectual level. Descriptions and analyses of other cultures and peoples may be presented, but the student does not experience the embarrassment of his mistakes or the joy of his successes in functioning in another culture. In other words, in the classroom there is relatively little involvement at the emotional level with the culture under study.

Leading educators have pointed out that more than the conventional college education is required to develop this type of understanding. Harris Wofford, formerly associate director of the Peace Corps and now president of Bryn Mawr College, says:

> The gap in understanding among nations and peoples, if not widening, is still enormous. The inadequacy of conventional academic education to close this gap—to prepare the people here and elsewhere for citizenship in the twentieth-century world community—is becoming obvious.[1]

How, then, is active understanding to be attained? Wofford points to the Peace Corps's form of "experiential" education—learning by doing on a world scale—as a possible way of filling this gap. In discussing experiential education, Wofford states:

> The division between teacher and student is blurred because the definition of a good Peace Corps Volunteer includes the possession of the spirit of learning. If the Volunteer does not have the learning spirit, that fact is going to be discovered in the difficult assignment in which he is engaged. People are going to sense that he has come to do good against them. In the Peace Corps you have to learn from those you teach, you have to learn by doing, and it is not only learning by doing, but learning by going. Migration, people on the move, going into a radically new setting, with the possibility of trading the old life for a new one—this is part of the energy and motivation in the Peace Corps kind of education, just as it was for those who migrated to Israel or, in earlier days, to America.[2]

It is through this type of experiential learning—learning to live in a different physical environment under a different set of cultural values—that active understanding takes place. Most important, we become acutely aware of our own cultural values and learn to take nothing for granted.

The reason it is so important in intercultural situations to be aware of our dependence on our own culture and the structural framework that it provides

---

[1]Harris Wofford, "The Future of the Peace Corps," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, No. 365 (May 1960), p. 136.

[2]Harris Wofford, as quoted in Harold Taylor, *The World as Teacher* (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1969), p.110.

is precisely because these things are taken so much for granted. We are aware of knowing the things we have been taught, but what we have learned through experience without conscious awareness tends to escape our notice. For example, as we encounter people of our own culture we are constantly making judgments, often non-consciously, as to sex, approximate age, race, social and educational background, and occupational grouping, using as a basis for these judgments physical appearance, dress, speech, and behavior. The cues by which we make these decisions are usually so subtle that it is difficult to explain how and why we reached a particular conclusion. Yet, with these same cues to go by we can predict another person's behavior to some extent, and our initial conversation is made easier. Using the same cues with someone from another culture, however, may not work. Americans frequently underestimate the age of Japanese, judging a college student in her mid-twenties to be a girl of 14 or 15, or assuming a forty-year-old man to be fresh out of college. Since one constantly adjusts one's speech and behavior accordingly, underestimating a person's age can result in insulting him. All too often we unconsciously treat the newly arrived foreign student who has difficulty expressing himself in English as if he were a child lacking in intelligence. In other words, we judge him as we would an American who spoke English in the same imperfect way.

Obviously, then, cues that help us function effectively in our own culture may be misleading in a cross-cultural situation. This is true of every aspect of behavior. Within our own culture we develop a sensitivity to others as to what is likely to make a person angry, what his facial expressions mean, what things he considers too personal for discussion, whether his words are to be interpreted literally or have a more subtle meaning behind them. It is impossible to function in any society without having certain expectations as to the behavior of others. We are, then, understandably unsettled by someone whose behavior we cannot predict, such as a drunken or mentally deranged person.

In intercultural situations we are likely to have the same reactions of anxiety or even fear when customary cues fail to predict the behavior of others. Until we learn the cues of the other culture, we find ourselves in an unstructured situation and do not know what to do or what to expect. This unsettling experience is called "culture shock."

Culture shock is the state of disorientation experienced by a person entering a new culture or subculture as he discovers for the first time that many of the things to which he is accustomed are unique to his own culture. The more culture-bound he is, the greater the shock. A monocultural person may be likened to the fish that knows the difference between comfortable and uncomfortable waters but does not realize its dependence on its aquatic surroundings until it is removed from them. The monocultural person is aware of those aspects that have been pointed out to him as being unique to his culture, but is unaware of that vast part that he has learned nonconsciously in the process of growing up.

A monocultural American couple travels to Japan for a vacation. They de-

(5)

cide to stay at a traditional Japanese inn rather than at a Western-style hotel. They find that their room opens onto a Japanese garden with a waterfall, and they are glad they chose the inn. The husband starts to take off his travel suit and, without knocking, the maid enters, bringing towels and tea. He is embarrassed, turns his back, and continues changing his clothes. The maid helps him, which embarrasses him all the more. When she finally disappears, he sits down with his wife to have some tea. After tea the wife starts to take off her stockings in order to put on Japanese footgear. The maid reappears to announce that the bath is ready. They find the maid is also present throughout the dinner to serve them and still later to make their bed. By the time they get to bed they have had enough of the maid's interruptions and wish she would not appear unless called. They also find it disturbing that the sliding doors to their room cannot be locked. They cannot understand why Japanese inns are so highly recommended. What they do not realize is the degree to which they, as Americans, have come to value privacy. To a Japanese, personal attention and service, including having one's back scrubbed in the bath, are essential for relaxation, while lack of privacy, to an American, interferes with relaxation.

During a short vacation, an isolated incident such as this may remain just that for the travelers. However, a series of such incidents might shake them out of the comfortable cocoon of their own culture and make them aware for the first time that some of the values, such as privacy, personal freedom, personal ownership, that they assume are shared by all people of the world are actually peculiar to their own culture. Also, they learn that the cues that they have been using to predict other people's behavior are culture-based. In learning the ways of the new culture, they must unlearn some of the things they have overlearned in their own culture.

In other words, the first step toward understanding another culture is becoming aware of one's own cultural habits and values so that they will not interfere with learning those of the new culture. Once this step is taken, learning a third and fourth culture will be easier. This is why a person who has achieved an active understanding of a second culture through experiential learning is aware of the relativity of cultural values, why he develops at visceral level an attitude of acceptance, respect, and tolerance of differences in cultures and thus is better prepared to learn and accept other cultures.

The need for active understanding of other cultures by professionals who deal with people of different cultural backgrounds is clearly of vital importance. Educational concern about this need was expressed in 1966 by participants at an Intercultural Seminar sponsored by the Council on Social Work Education:

> . . . questions regarding the values of one's own and other cultures ought to be highlighted in social work education everywhere. The student ought to understand value conflicts as he might find them in himself and as he meets with them in clients. He should recognize a conflict between his own values and those of others within the culture. He also should have an understanding of the values of different ethnic groups, economic groups,

(6)

> religions, etc., especially as they may conflict with one another. Means ought to be found to overcome the culture-bound values, and attitudes associated with them, with which the student frequently comes in contact. A heightened awareness, as compared with the almost nonconscious acceptance of certain values . . . ought to be cultivated.[3]

It was to meet this type of need that the educational project reported here was conceived. It was an attempt to explore ways in social work education of preparing graduates to work effectively in intercultural settings. This program offered an experience aimed toward helping students develop a cross-cultural perspective through an active understanding of other cultures and enriching their skills through realistic communication with people in their own and other cultures and subcultures.

The assumption was that whether a social worker is in domestic or international practice, he will need to have an understanding of culturally different perceptions and interpretations of problems, of culturally inherent means of resolving them, and of ways of communicating with those with whom or on whose behalf he works.

Although the project has much in common with the Peace Corps in that both involved experiential learning, there were distinct differences. The major role the Peace Corps volunteer plays is that of a worker to assist in building or developing some project or program in the country to which he is assigned. In effect, he is a person sent to a country by the United States government to serve the people there. Preparation for the assignment includes training in the language and the culture specific to the country. In other words, the Peace Corps volunteer has a specific role to play in a specific culture. Whatever he personally learns through the experience is a by-product rather than the major aim of the program.

In this project, the student had no definite role to play in the foreign culture. He received minimum training specific to the culture. He was not sent to provide social service to the people of the culture or to carry out a research project. He was there only to learn the culture. In other words, he assumed the humble role of learner, with everybody in the culture a potential teacher from whom he could learn.

The lack of a specific role left the student with no special status except that of a social work student at the University of Hawaii. He could not play the role of a professional, nor could he play that of a cultural ambassador since he was not there to introduce American ways of doing things. In other words, the student was given only minimum structure in which to operate. This built-in ambiguity in the new culture characterizes this project and makes it substantially different from the Peace Corps type of experiential learning.

The major aim of the project was to prepare social workers who could func-

---

[3]Herbert H. Aptekar, "The Values, Functions, and Methods of Social Work: An Interpretive Report of the Honolulu Seminar," in *An Intercultural Exploration: Universals and Differences in Social Work Values, Functions, and Practice*, Report of the Intercultural Seminar, The East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1967), Part I, p. 51.

tion effectively in any culture or subculture, inside or outside their own, and to help them grow in the direction of being more flexible and creative through experiential learning. To accomplish the first goal, it was important that the active understanding gained in one culture be easily transferable to other cultures, that is, capable of generalization. It was believed that the students, by being given minimum culture-specific instruction and training, would search and grope and find out for themselves such things as customs in greeting, in accepting or declining invitations, in interacting with people of different social positions, and so on. No prescriptive handbooks were provided, no dos and don'ts. The students were expected to sort out their observations on their own and determine which were recurrent patterns of behavior or practice and which could be dismissed as idiosyncratic personal characteristics of individuals rather than cultural behavior. This put the students in the role of full-time learners.

The lack of structure in the learning situation forced the student to face ambiguity and gradually to build a structure that would serve as a cultural framework of his own. The exercise of trying things out, of using alternatives until the most suitable or workable solution was found—whether in interpreting some aspect of the culture or in building a general framework for that culture—was considered an important part of the training. By going through such an experience once, a student will get an idea of how to do it again the next time. In other words, he learns "how to learn" another culture. He will develop, it is hoped, an aptness for sensing or perceiving another person's feelings, views, and needs, no matter what the cultural background.

It was also thought that this exercise in building sensible patterns out of initial ambiguities would move the student not only toward biculturality but also in the direction of multiculturality. The emphasis placed on the process of learning another culture rather than on its content was designed to help the student develop a sensitivity to cues in any culture with which he comes in contact. This was one of the most significant objectives of the project.

The built-in ambiguity in the project was also designed to force the student to engage in divergent—as opposed to convergent—thinking (see below, pp. 000). Just as he learns much about his own culture by stepping outside of it and viewing it objectively, so does he discover more about himself, often including strengths heretofore dormant such as a readiness to risk himself in uncertain environments, a feeling of being challenged by the need to look beyond the known to discover different and perhaps untried approaches in various situations, and an assurance of his ability to deal with a variety of unpredictable events. Except in the rare instance where the experience poses a threat to the total personality—the likelihood of which was reduced in this project by the provision of certain supports—the student returns to his own culture a new person, with much more confidence in himself.

On the assumption that the above goals were achievable within the limitations of a well-planned curriculum, an interdisciplinary training project was

carried out by the co-authors of this book. The project is described in detail in the following chapters and shows how active understanding of other cultures may be achieved through experiential learning and how such a learning experience can lead to the greater personal development of the participants.

Chapter II

THE PROJECT

So far we have emphasized the need for cross-cultural understanding, particularly among professionals such as social workers who work with people. The project—briefly described later in this chapter and in detail in succeeding chapters—was conceived to provide the training necessary to enable those professionals to deal with people of varying cultural backgrounds. The social worker deals most frequently with the "culturally disadvantaged," that is, people whose cultural or subcultural backgrounds are other than that of white middle-class America, of which the social worker himself is likely to be a product. To be able to work effectively with people of different cultures and subcultures, the social worker needs an active understanding that goes beyond the passive, albeit sympathetic, level.

In order to achieve this, we moved the social work student away from home ground for part of the training. We considered this move the most important ingredient of the training. It might be asked why the trainee could not have worked instead with recently arrived immigrants or minority groups in the neighborhood, which would seem more practical and economical. There were good reasons for not doing so, however, and these will become apparent later, particularly in Chapter VI, which deals with variations of the original project.

Theoretical Bases

In the previous chapter it was proposed that becoming aware of our own culture is the first step in understanding another. However, it is difficult to develop a clear awareness of our own culture because we take so much for granted. We are provided with a culturally established framework in which to operate and predict the behavior of other people. Our judgments and behavior become almost automatic. For instance, we have different sets of expectations

as to how to dress and behave in different social situations, that is, structured situations such as meetings, luncheons, picnics, cocktail parties, dinner parties, wedding receptions, or funerals. We alter our behavior depending on what is expected of us. When we find ourselves in a completely new situation and do not know how we are supposed to behave, we feel uncomfortable. We experience anxiety because the situation is ambiguous; we do not know what the rules are. We all have had such experiences in the process of growing up—the first date, the first formal banquet, the first meeting with an important person, the first foreign meal served without knives and forks.

All other things being equal, people tend to avoid an ambiguous situation in favor of a structured one. There are, however, individual differences in the degree to which one is willing to tolerate ambiguous situations. Maslow points out that each of us is subject to two sets of forces: one which leans toward defense or safety, the other toward growth.

> Every human being has both sets of forces within him. One set clings to safety and defensiveness out of fear, tending to regress backward, hanging on to the past . . . afraid to take chances, afraid to jeopardize what he already has, afraid of independence, freedom, and separateness. The other set of forces impels him forward toward wholeness of Self and uniqueness of Self, toward full functioning of all his capacities, toward confidence in the face of the external world at the same time that he can accept his deepest, real unconscious Self. . . .
>
> Therefore we can consider the process of healthy growth to be a never ending series of free choice situations, confronting each individual at every point throughout his life, in which he must choose between the delights of safety and growth, dependence and independence, regression and progression, immaturity and maturity. Safety has both anxieties and delights; growth has both anxieties and delights. We grow forward when the delights of growth and anxieties of safety are greater than the anxieties of growth and the delights of safety.[1]

In Maslow's terms, it is the force for safety that makes one choose the familiar over the unfamiliar. Related to Maslow's two forces are two basic cognitive or intellective modes identified by Guilford[2] in his factor analytic study of the intellect, namely, convergent and divergent modes of thinking.

Convergent thinking refers essentially to logical thinking, with a number of facts leading to one conclusion. In contrast, divergent thinking, using a fact or stimulus as a starting point, can go in different directions. There is no one correct answer in divergent thinking; a number of alternatives are available. Getzels and Jackson contrast the two modes of thinking as follows: "The convergent mode tends toward retaining the known, learning the predetermined, and conserving what is," while the divergent mode "tends toward revising the known, exploring the undetermined, and constructing what might be."[3]

---

[1]Abraham Maslow, "Defense and Growth," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 37-38.

[2]J. Paul Guilford, *Personality* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

[3]Jacob W. Getzels and Philip W. Jackson, *Creativity and Intelligence: Exploration with Gifted Students* (New York: John Wiley, 1962), pp. 13-14.

Although both processes are found in all individuals, they are found in varying proportions. A person for whom the convergent mode is primary tends toward the usual and expected, while a person for whom the divergent mode is primary tends toward the novel and speculative. Put in other terms, one mode represents intellectual acquisitiveness and conformity, the other intellectual inventiveness and innovation. To engage in divergent thinking, one must be willing to risk oneself, to take chances and be prepared for unexpected, possibly negative, outcomes.

Our educational system is rather weak in providing opportunities for divergent thinking. The use of standardized tests in evaluation and selection of individuals is becoming more widespread, not only in education but also in all walks of life. Standardized texts that capitalize on technological advancement in machine scoring, computer analysis and print out (like IQ tests), usually allow for only one correct answer. Since the quality of the school, the success of the teacher, and the ability of the student are all evaluated on the basis of standardized achievement test scores, teachers orient their teaching and students their learning toward good performances on these tests. As a result, convergent thinking is encouraged throughout most of the student's formal education. Students come to think there is only one right answer and tend to absolutize what is "right." In a technological age such as ours, the educational system for the masses tends to encourage absolute judgments and rigidity in thinking and gives few opportunities for divergent thinking.

It is not formal education alone that encourages convergent thinking in the growing child and inhibits divergent thinking or creativity. Schachtel, the psychoanalyst who approaches creativity through the framework of a perceptual theory, points out that in the very process of socialization in a particular culture the child is pressured to accept the "given," the "codes," and the "predetermined categories" of his culture.

> In everybody's life one can observe the effect of the pressure of society as represented by parents, teachers, peers, toward the formation of a more or less definite, closed view of life and the world, a certain code of behavior as well as often very definite views about things and people and what they are for. These views may be explicit or implicit. The parents answer the child's endless questions and their answers usually transmit the labels of the culture, the names of things, whether they are useful or useless, good or bad, etc. . . . The same holds true for teachers. Parents and teachers, in transmitting the current sociocultural views of the world to the child, can help both to open and to close the world for the child. Even if they mostly want to open it, they cannot help but close it, in some ways, because there is no man who is not to a considerable extent embedded in the culture in which he grew up, the language of his culture, etc.[4]

Taylor, known for his innovative educational approach, also writes as follows:

---

[4]Ernest George Schachtel, as quoted in Jacob W. Getzels and Philip W. Jackson, *Metamorphosis: On the Development of Affect, Perception, Attention, and Memory* (New York: Basic Books, 1959), p. 187.

> His [the child's] capacity to go on learning more about the world depends on his openness to it and the opportunities for extending his range. The child who has never been more than three blocks from home, or a mile from his father's rice paddy, who can't read and who knows no one who is not like himself, is condemned to a narrow orbit of self-awareness, a meager knowledge of the world at large, and a very slim chance that he will ever know more than he does.
>
> Through the normal course of growing up in his own culture, each child is taught what he is intended to know, and his sense of identity, his attitudes, depend on the cultural milieu in which they are developed and what he has been taught to believe about himself. In order to know anything, it is necessary to be able to relate it to something already known, to look at the world from one's own point of view. But to do that means narrowing the world to a single perspective, thus distorting the reality of what can only be seen clearly and truthfully from a larger view and from many perspectives.[5]

The child's "knowing" is accomplished through perceptual learning. The process of perceptual learning is described by Gibson, one of the foremost authorities on perception, as one of learning "what to attend to, both overtly and covertly." It involves learning to detect the critical or distinctive features of objects and events and to abstract the general properties. Although Gibson focuses his work on the perception of physical dimensions and does not concern himself with social perception, one can infer from many of his statements that there are differential effects on perceptual learning due to cultural differences. He states that "the education of the perceptual system depends mainly on the individual's history of exposure to the environment."[6]

Gibson also discusses the acquisition of "what might be called economical perception" and considers it as one kind of perceptual development. He defines this as "the ability to avoid distraction—to concentrate on one thing at a time in the face of everything going on in the environment—and yet to accomplish as much knowing as possible." In economical perception, "only the information required to identify a thing economically tends to be picked up from a complex of stimulus information. All the other available information that would be required to specify its unique and complete identity in the whole universe of things is not attended to."[7]

In other words, perception is *selective*. In the process of growing up in a culture, the child learns to focus on those attributes important for obtaining essential information in his environment and to screen out the rest. What is attended to are the critical or distinctive features in Gibson's terms, criterial attributes in the theories of Bruner *et al*.[8] and Brown.[9]

To a large extent, the attributes or features one learns to attend to selec-

---

[5]Harold Taylor, *The World as Teacher* (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1969), pp. 1-2.

[6]J.J. Gibson, *The Senses Considered as Perceptual Systems* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), p. 268.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 286.

[8]Jerome S. Bruner, J.J. Goodnow, and G. A. Austin, *A Study of Thinking* (New York: John Wiley, 1956).

[9]Roger W. Brown, *Words and Things* (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958).

tively may be determined or limited by the geographic and cultural environment. Although depth perception of the visual field may be universal, the perception as three dimensional of a picture or diagram which is on a two-dimensional plane may not extend to an environment where no such pictures or diagrams are available, as Hudson's study in Africa shows.[10] Cross-cultural studies on the perception of optical illusions have also suggested the strong influence of the cultural and geographic environments in the development of different perceptual inference habits in different societies.[11]

Culture is expected to play a much more decisive role in the selection of attributes to attend to in social perception, especially in person perception. Tagiuri, in his discussion of person perception, points out that:

> . . . in our culture, inferences concerning "honesty," "sincerity," or "gentleness" may be quickly drawn when certain forms of behavior are perceived, while in other cultures, other typologies are used; for example, certain Southwestern Indians wonder first whether the other person does or does not have witchcraft power.[12]

We can see here how cultural differences can lead to misunderstanding due to selective attention to different aspects of behavior or different inferences drawn from the same behavior. For instance, we have learned from experience how to estimate a person's age. Although we may not be able to identify all the cues, we do use them in estimating age. When we meet someone of a different race, we frequently find that the cues or criterial attributes we have been using for our own people do not work, and we end up underestimating or overestimating the person's age. The fact that people in the person's own culture can estimate the age correctly suggests that their criterial attributes are different from ours. We have learned to attend selectively to our own criterial attributes and at the same time to screen out the criterial attributes used in the other culture to differentiate between twenty- and forty-year-olds.

Language, as one of the major components of culture, also plays a role in determining the criterial attributes for selective perception. There are a number of studies on how the vocabulary, syntax, or phonology of a language influence the perception of those who speak it.

Language provides readily available labels for perceptual categorization. All items referred to by the same label have certain attributes (the criterial attributes) in common. One learns to attend selectively to those criterial attributes in using the particular label. For instance, one concept frequently used in Japan in relation to art and individual taste is *shibui*. There is no equivalent term in English, so the concept cannot be easily explained. It has been described as "beauty that is understated, never obvious, deceptively simple

---

[10]W. Hudson, "Pictorial Depth Perception in Sub-Cultural Groups in Africa," *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 52 (November 1960), pp. 183-208.

[11]See, for example, G. W. Allport and T. F. Pettigrew, "Cultural Influence on the Perception of Movement: The Trapezoidal Illusion Among the Zulus," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 55, No. 1 (1957), pp. 104-113; and M. H. Segall, D. T. Campbell, and M. J. Herskovits, *The Influence of Culture on Visual Perception* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966).

[12]Renato Tagiuri, "Person Perception," in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson, eds., *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 2d. ed., 1969) p. 418.

while really being complex." This, however, is not sufficient to enable a non-Japanese to classify an object as being beautiful in a *shibui* way. One has to be exposed to a number of items classified as *shibui* to grasp what the criterial attributes are. Yet the Japanese child will learn this concept with little conscious effort, just as he learns all other concepts of his culture. As the American must struggle to learn the concept of *shibui*, so must the Japanese struggle to learn the meaning of "I'm sorry." The word "sorry" is used on a number of different occasions with a common element, but it is hard for a Japanese to see the common element when these same occasions require distinctly different expressions in Japanese. He is likely to consider the expression an apology and to become confused when he tells an American friend of his father's death and the friend replies "I'm sorry."

These examples show the effect of geographical, cultural, and linguistic environment on non-conscious learning. Perceptual learning in these cases was not accomplished through training; it came naturally while the individual was growing up. It should be remembered that what is learned in this way gets repeatedly reinforced and that these non-conscious behaviors, including perceptual inferences, become automatic. The interpretation of behaviors and events is immediate and requires little thinking or conscious evaluation. These automatic habits are not easy to break, but there is little need to break them as long as they are functional in the society in which one lives. In other words, one is rewarded for "retaining the known, learning the predetermined, and conserving what is," in the normal range of functioning in society.[13]

It would seem, then, that stepping out of one's own culture into a new one would help to break the habit of convergent thinking. Through the mistakes one makes in the new culture by using habits from the old, one becomes aware of the influences on oneself of the previous culture. As a result of going through a series of ego-involving failure and success experiences, active—as opposed to passive—understanding of the new culture is achieved. As pointed out in the previous chapter, culture shock is an essential ingredient of learning another culture.

Learning a second culture is much like learning a second language. The more similar they are, the easier it is to learn the second language, but the greater the interference, or negative transfer, from the first. When two cultures are similar, minor differences frequently go unnoticed and assumptions of similarity are made that prevent the learning of subtle nuances of the second culture. For this reason, a culture quite different from one's own has a stronger effect in shaking one out of one's cultural habits, owing to the greater emotional and intellectual shock. Just as we maintain that culture shock is essential to the achieving of active understanding of another culture, so we also maintain that the choice of a non-Western culture as the second culture for the Western learner will have a greater overall impact.

With the realization that he can no longer use his own cultural framework,

---

[13]Getzels and Jackson, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

the learner is left to continue on his own, functioning in a rather uncomfortable and ambiguous situation until a new framework is provided or until he structures one himself. In this project, learning how to learn another culture was a more important goal than learning the specifics of the culture, and going through this stage of facing ambiguity was considered essential in learning how to learn. The students were not told about the values and customs in the second culture or about the behavior of the people. They were expected to find these out for themselves by groping. Putting together what at the beginning seemed isolated and unrelated events, looking for consistent patterns, and eventually developing some overall structure as a framework for that culture were exercises in the learning process. It was considered that learning to tolerate ambiguities until one knows more about the situation would have a generalizable effect, not only on learning the new culture but also on the personal development of the learner.

Since the codes of the new culture are not given, the student may try alternative ways of interpreting events and deciding how he should behave. This forces him to engage in divergent thinking. Thus, learning a second culture is qualitatively different from the usual type of learning in schools. In general, advancement in education within one's own culture involves specialization. In learning the new subject matter, the student utilizes the cognitive mode developed so far and learns to make finer differentiations in what was an undifferentiated whole. In learning a second culture, however, the student must not only learn to make finer differentiations, but he must also learn to ignore the system of criterial attributes that was used in his first culture and to make differentiations along a new set of criterial attributes. Uriel G. Foa and Martin M. Chemers[14] also point out this difference in role behavior when they say that socialization involves learning to differentiate while acculturation requires both an increase in differentiation and the forgetting of certain previously learned differentiations. High intelligence or a great ability in convergent thinking do not make the task any easier. What is required is an ability in divergent thinking and a flexibility in cognitive reorganization.

Psychologists tend to agree that a non-authoritarian person who is open-minded, tolerant of ambiguity, and flexible will make a better adjustment in a new culture. The opposite type, the authoritarian personality,[15] is closed-minded, cannot accept views different from his own, is ethnocentric and thus prejudiced against people of another ethnic background, considers his cultural values to be absolute, and would like to see those who violate these values punished. He is submissive toward those above him but aggressive toward those under him. He tends to dichotomize the world into black and white, and cannot tolerate any grey areas. Everything must be neatly categorized. In

---

[14]Uriel G. Foa and Martin M. Chemers, "The Significance of Role Behavior Differentiation for Cross-Cultural Interaction Training," *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1967), pp. 45-57.

[15]Theodor W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950).

other words, he has no tolerance for ambiguity.

When we compare the typical monocultural person and a bicultural person who knows a Western and a non-Western culture, we can see some relationship between the two types of personality—the authoritarian and the monocultural on the one hand and the non-authoritarian and the bicultural on the other. Although the Peace Corps selected their volunteers in terms of those characteristics associated with potential ability to adjust to a new cultural environment, we took the position that the experience of learning a new culture and adjusting to a new cultural environment will make the person more non-authoritarian. In other words, we have reversed the independent and dependent variables.

This was not a research project; it was a training project and was limited to a small number of participants. However, as the training was going on, we were testing—without rigid experimental design—the hypothesis that learning an unfamiliar non-Western culture in an unstructured situation would lead to the development of personality characteristics generally associated with the non-authoritarian person.

Description of the Project

The underlying assumption of the project was that professional education for social work should emphasize an active understanding of cultural differences and encourage graduates to deal with these cultural differences as they now deal with individual differences. The educational assumption was that a relatively unstructured learning experience in a different culture, preceded by a seminar emphasizing the awareness of one's own culture and broadened perceptions and followed by an integrating seminar, would be likely to have a strong and permanent impact on a student's learning. The experience was expected to have a generalizing effect that would extend to tolerance, understanding, sensitivity, and new perceptions in other cultures and subcultures, and to ease in divergent thinking and creativity in solving problems.

The project design called for both cognitive and experiential learning opportunities. A pre-training seminar emphasized cognitive learning; the experience in another culture provided the opportunity for both affective and cognitive learning, but the emphasis was on affective learning. The final integrating seminar emphasized a cognitive approach, but with a blending of affective-cognitive learning. In other words, three interdependent types of experience were involved: (1) the process of becoming consciously aware of one's own culture in order to see it in relation to another culture or subculture; (2) a field learning experience of sufficient affective strength and integrity to disorganize customary comfortable values, patterns of thought, and behavior; and (3) the opportunity for integration and a conscious formulation and use of the learning.

The broad interdependent learning objectives of the project were: (1) to achieve an active understanding of another culture in the sense of seeking

generalizations that recognize the validity of different values and different ways of meeting life's problems, thereby developing an approach that is translatable to other cultures and subcultures; and (2) to move toward personal growth by (a) becoming aware of one's own cultural as well as personal biases in perception and interpretation of values, behavior, and so on; (b) developing sensitivity to cultural differences; (c) developing ways of correcting one's own biases through self-awareness and self-evaluation; all leading to (d) developing one's creativity through the discovery of solutions to problems. The result would be an increased effectiveness in professional communication with people in all sectors of a population, in subcultures, and in other cultures.

Components of the Project

The project extended over a period of three and one-half years and provided learning experiences for three groups of students in each of three consecutive years. Each student was involved for one calendar year, with a final evaluative summary due three months later, just prior to graduation. The third year was a variation of the original project.

Selection of Students

For practical reasons, only six students could participate each year; therefore, a plan for selection was necessary. All students in their first graduate year in social work were told about the project approximately one month before the end of their first semester. Those interested were asked to develop a brief statement on their particular interest in participating. They were asked to keep in mind four questions: Why would you like to participate in this project? What do you consider your strengths, also your possible limitations, for participation? What difficulties would you expect to encounter? In what ways do you see the project as contributing to your educational preparation?

No formal testing was used to select the participants. (The Peace Corps found the use of tests relatively unsatisfactory.) Instead, the students' statements of interest, plus information about residence, friendship circle, travel, hobbies, and interests obtained from admission materials were used to assess the students' flexibility, open-mindedness, motivation for learning another culture, learning skill and competence, future work/plans, and capacity for self-evaluation. Three readers rated the applicants on a scale of high, medium, and low, with a heavier weight given to motivation.[16]

Pre-training Seminar

This met for two hours weekly throughout the spring semester preceding the field experience. The general learning objective was to develop attitudes of awareness and receptivity to the learning objective explained above. The specific learning objectives were to become familiar with field methodology and to learn a little of the history of the site selected for the field experience.

An interdisciplinary approach was used in the pre-training seminar. Both

---

[16]This process of selection was used only for the original project—the two groups who went to Guam.

instructors—one a social psychologist who had competence in three languages and knowledge of several others, and the other a social worker—had experience in other cultures. Pre-training was focused on preparing the students for the field learning in the sense of bringing appropriate theory, research findings, ideas, illustrations, and reflective questions into consciousness, for the purpose of transfer and use in responding to differences, ambiguities, and uncertainties in the field learning. In other words, the pre-training aimed at establishing a mental attitude that would help the students to become active rather than passive learners during their field experience.

Field Training

The purpose of the field training was for the students to experience a different culture, to become immersed in it, for a period of eight weeks. The students had no professional role, no program, no service. They had only themselves to give and to use in interacting and in developing relationships. They were not there to bring about cultural or other changes in the people or in the situation. The learning objectives were (1) to observe, hear, feel, and comprehend the other culture as deeply as possible; (2) to move toward biculturality, in the sense of developing cultural sensitivity and awareness and an expanded outlook; and (3) to develop divergent thinking in seeking solutions to the difficulties, problems, and situations encountered.

The project, designed with the field experience as the core component, reflects the belief that conscious learning while living *in* or experiencing another culture is different from learning *about* that culture or understanding it cognitively. In the former, the whole self—the ego—is involved. Emotion is an important factor in culture learning. Affective learning is regarded as being of prime importance in the field experience.

The social work instructor, who had participated in the pre-training seminar and was involved in planning for the experience in the other culture, accompanied the students to the field. Her responsibility was to help them make learning conscious, to provide a channel for positive use of frustrating and confusing experiences, to assist the students in exploring and identifying possible generalizations and in the development of ideas, and, through contacts with local personnel, to enhance the opportunities for learning.

A weekly field seminar provided the students with a regular channel for feedback, interchange, discussion of frustrations, questions, checking out of observations, and so on. Student behavioral objectives were development of the ability (1) to perceive his experience in the frame of reference of the second culture, (2) to identify and analyze the significance of differences between his own and the second culture in such matters as activities, behavior, and problem solving, and (3) to suggest some tentative implications for social work.

Students kept a daily journal in which they recorded observations, experiences, frustrations, ideas, and questions. In the beginning, they were cautioned only to describe the event, situation, or reaction, rather than to try to interpret or categorize. In this way, they would not impose their own mean-

ing before they had had a chance to discover the meaning in the other culture. For example, what is interpreted as aggressive behavior by a student from the United States may not have the same meaning in the new culture. The journals included records of such things as unfamiliar terms or English terms with unfamiliar meanings; puzzling expressions, behavior, and situations; instances of being misunderstood; instances of being "lost" as to what was expected of them or of being unable to read the cues; and occasions that revealed differences in values.

The journals also included impressions, brief descriptions of and views about both planned and unplanned learning experiences, and miscellaneous observations or experiences that seemed significant. The journals had no structured format, but were more like diaries. Emphasis was on fluidity in recording experiences and impressions, and subjective data as well as certain factual data were highly valued.

Summary of Field Learning

One month after the return to the home culture, each student wrote an analytical summary of the field learning experience. Each was encouraged to develop his summary in his own way, but it was expected that all aspects of his field learning would be reflected in the summary.

Integration Seminar

This lasted through one semester following the field training and met for two hours weekly. The principal learning objectives were: (1) to demonstrate—in reports, discussions, presentations, and conceptualizations—the integration of the learning; (2) to continue developing a pattern of divergent thinking; and (3) to develop skill in self-evaluation. The major teaching resources for the seminar were the students' journals, tapes of the summer field seminar, pre-training material, and the analytical summaries. Bibliographies were developed as needed.

Final Summary

Just before graduation, each student revised his original analytical summary. The revised summary was expected to have greater objectivity and to incorporate the experience acquired during the second year of graduate work. It also offered an opportunity to compare and evaluate the changes that had endured and those that had proved transient.

All students in the social work program have a practicum in both years of study. Insofar as possible, the students who participated in the project were given an opportunity in their second-year practicum to work with people from other cultures or ethnic groups.

It was expected that the project would have implications for (1) social work education in the United States and other countries, (2) education in related professions, and (3) program development and practice. Also, it could possibly promote interdisciplinary efforts in the development of foundation knowledge content in professional curricula.

Chapter III

COGNITIVE LEARNING

Although the emphasis of the project was on experiential learning, students were involved in cognitive learning as well. Affective learning was emphasized in the field experience in another culture, but cognitive learning was also expected. The integration seminar was a blending of cognitive and affective learning; however, the learning in the pre-training seminar was essentially cognitive.

By cognitive learning we mean learning by means of intellectual exercise. The pre-training seminar, which met once a week for two hours during the spring semester preceding the field experience, took a rational, intellectual approach in preparing the students for two months of living in a different culture. The general purposes were: (1) to help the students understand the goals of the project and the reasons the project took the form it did to achieve those goals, and (2) to provide theoretical knowledge that would help them interpret and organize their experiences in the field.

Pre-Training Seminar

The learning objectives of the seminar (see Chapter II) called for content primarily from social psychology and anthropology that is not usually found in social work education except, perhaps, tangentially. The content of the seminar is seen as new input in the sense that it was selected as being basic to the desired culture learning and was organized within the context of social work education. A number of the students recalled that they had covered concepts of perception, stereotyping, cultural bias, and so on in undergraduate study but that the knowledge had not connected with other knowledge, had remained isolated, and tended to be forgotten.

The content of the seminar remained essentially constant throughout the three years, but organization, presentation, discussion, reading, and out-of-

class assignments were modified each year as a result of the previous year's experience or to accommodate the students' varying backgrounds. The topics of the pre-training seminar, briefly touched upon in the previous chapter, are discussed in greater detail here.

In the opening session, students were told that their goals were: (1) to learn another culture in order to move away from monoculturality and (2) to develop their creativity through personal growth. The form that the project would take to achieve these goals and the purpose of the pre-training seminar were explained. Students were asked to relate theories and concepts introduced in the seminar to actual situations wherever possible. They were encouraged to relate relevant experiences of their own and to raise questions freely in class.

Selective Perception

The key concept throughout the seminar was selective perception and, as such, was the first theoretical concept introduced. It was considered important to make the students aware of their cultural biases in some way at the very beginning, and this was the logical place to start. A symbol perception test developed by Niyekawa-Howard enabled each student to examine the symbols perceived selectively and the reasons for doing so. The students realized that the symbols they tended to recognize—aside from those with structural features, such as size, color, and shape, that made them stand out by contrast—were symbols with which they were familiar or to which they could give verbal labels. They also recognized individual differences related to varied interests, background, and aesthetic orientations as well as similarities arising from shared backgrounds. (A film on visual perception that pointed out how assumptions based on past experience can lead to erroneous interpretations in visual illusions was shown to emphasize how strong our perceptual inference habits are.)

Through slides of figure-ground reversals, it was pointed out that one cannot focus on both figure and ground at the same time; whatever one focuses on becomes figure and the rest recedes to become background. Thus, by focusing on some aspects of the visual stimuli, we end up screening out the rest. For this reason, perception is always distorted by selectivity (except in the case of an eidetic, i.e., a person with unusually vivid mental images). What one selectively perceives differs according to temporary needs, personality, and culture, apart from the structural aspect inherent in the stimuli. As an example of temporary needs affecting perception, take the students themselves. Because they were going to Guam and needed to know more about it, they noticed anything related to Guam in newspapers, conversations, and so on which previously they would have let pass by unnoticed.

If temporary needs can have such an influence on selective perception, it is easy to see that enduring needs are likely to have an even greater influence. Projective tests of personality, such as the Thematic Apperception Test or the Rorschach Test, make use of the fairly consistent tendency in the selectivity of

perception of an individual. When people of a particular culture share the tendency to perceive certain things selectively, then the selectivity may be considered to be due to cultural influences. The example cited in the previous chapter by Tagiuri is a case in point. It is with this aspect that the project was concerned.

"Economic perception," discussed earlier, is learned without conscious effort. An infant growing up in an English-speaking environment, for instance, learns non-consciously to ignore the finer difference between the sounds of the letter *p* in *spin* and *pin*, where one *p* is unaspirated and the other is aspirated. Not hearing the difference here does not hinder communication; however, if one does not hear the difference between *p* and *b*, as in *pin* and *bin*, communication is hampered. Thus, we selectively notice whether certain consonants are voiced or not. The infant growing up in a Chinese-speaking community, however, will learn to notice when *t* or *p* is aspirated because it makes a difference in the meaning of a word. The strong habits in selective perception of the sounds of one's mother tongue are part of the difficulty in learning to listen to or to speak another language at a later age. These habits constitute interference; they must be unlearned if one is learning a new language.

Although linguistic science can point out problem areas in learning another language, in many other aspects of learning another culture not enough is known to make it easier for the learner. For instance, cues picked up in nonverbal communication are largely non-conscious, yet they are selectively perceived. As we continue to perceive selectively, i.e., to focus on certain cues, we may be screening out other important cues in the new culture. Thus, we may not be able to differentiate the many meanings of, say, a smile in Japanese or Korean cultures.

It was important here for the student to understand that perception is selective and to become prepared for changes in his own selectivity, that is, to begin to notice things that he is accustomed to screen out.

Categorization and Stereotyping

Perception involves giving meaning to what one perceives, that is, interpreting. One sees a four-legged furry animal running away from another four-legged but bigger animal and calls the former a "cat" and the latter a "dog." One sees a little boy pushing another off the see-saw in the park and calls the former an "aggressive" boy. These labels indicate the interpretation given. To call an animal a "dog" or a "cat" or to call a certain behavior aggressive is to categorize them on the basis of specific features. The features that serve as a basis for categorization are the criterial attributes discussed earlier and we tend to focus only on those attributes that are essential for categorizing things and events. Attributes that are non-essential, that is, non-criterial for classification purposes, may escape notice. An example is the aspiration of the letter "*p*" for speakers of English.

One student gave an example of the way an American, newly arrived in the

Philippines, would describe a Filipino: "about five feet two inches tall, with dark eyes, black hair, dark-complexioned." This is a description that might identify him in the United States but is useless in the Philippines, where most people would fit that description. Until the American learns to notice the finer details that differentiate one Filipino from another, what he perceives on the basis of habit serves little purpose. In other words, depending on what one focuses, things will look similar or dissimilar.

Categorization involves classifying items on the basis of similarity, not in just any attributes but in criterial attributes. Hence, a chihuahua is more like a German shepherd dog than like a cat and is classified as a dog, although to an infant he may seem more like a cat in that both are small pets that can be fondled and carried by him. In classifying dogs, size is a non-criterial attribute and is ignored. Paying attention to non-criterial attributes can lead one to make the wrong classification in terms of convergent thinking.

Classifying items as "dog" or "tall" or "intelligent" or "aggressive" or "American" or "red" means putting them into discrete categories when actually they may be found on a continuum. This is particularly true when it comes to behavior. Take, for instance, "rude" behavior. When one criticizes another as being rude, a certain kind of behavior, whatever it may be, is labelled "rude." But what constitutes rude behavior? An American businessman meeting a Japanese businessman may, in his eagerness to make a good impression, show extreme friendliness. As soon as he is introduced, he calls the Japanese man by his first name, conducts himself very informally, and occasionally jokes. The Japanese businessman's selective perception, however, is oriented toward evaluating the appropriateness of behavior according to status. Lack of reserve on the part of the American is likely to be interpreted as "rudeness." His smile and his openness may go unnoticed, and on the basis of his relaxed—as opposed to reserved and stiff—behavior, he is classified as impolite.

Once an object or behavior is interpreted, classified, or labeled, the details that make it unique are forgotten and reclassification becomes difficult. If, for that particular culture, this interpretation or classification is erroneous, misunderstandings will follow. For the student going into a new culture, this underlines the importance of not interpreting or classifying too early. It would be better for him to record in his journal as much detail as possible without labeling or classifying, since in the beginning he will be using only criteria from his own culture.

Classifying people into categories and making assumptions about their traits is stereotyping. In other words, stereotyping is classifying a person on the basis of one or two criterial attributes which are assumed to characterize his group—be it racial, ethnic, age, sex, or social class—and then assuming that all attributes associated with that particular category apply to the person. At the same time, the unique characteristics of the individual himself are ignored.

Stereotyping on the basis of nationality is common. During the training, some of the students related their experiences of being stereotyped when liv-

ing or traveling abroad. The important thing here was the emotional reaction, the resentment at being stereotyped even by people who had never had direct contact with the student's culture. Just as the student from the United States in a new culture must work to be recognized as an individual, so must he learn to see the people of the new culture as individuals and to separate individual from cultural traits.

How does one recognize that a trait is unique to an individual and not common to the people of his culture? Obviously, this cannot be done at first meeting. As has been pointed out repeatedly, at this stage the student must keep an open mind and try to perceive as much as possible without automatically screening out what he is accustomed to consider irrelevant or insignificant. Each observation must be kept separate. Labeling and categorizing must be suspended. When certain things are observed repeatedly, when a recurrent pattern is noted, then one may tentatively create a category. As more and more patterns emerge, interrelationships between them may be hypothesized and a cultural framework established. However, until one has had enough exposure to and contact with the people of a new culture, no generalizations should be made.

Economical Perception

Economical perception enables one to identify and categorize things on the basis of the minimum identifiable characteristics or criterial attributes; it is not possible in the initial stages of learning another culture. Although the practical need to categorize is recognized, if categorization is made too soon (before the student knows what words and behaviors mean in the other culture's frame of reference), misunderstanding as a result of misinterpretation is inevitable. Having to note every detail, at the same time suspending categorization, can make this initial stage in a new culture intellectually as well as emotionally exhausting.

Cultural Bias and Cultural Delimitation

Cultural bias and cultural delimitation were, in a sense, the pivot of the pre-training seminar since they were related to all the previous material as well as to what followed. The purpose was to help the students realize how bound or limited one is by one's own culture and to recognize the advantages of being bi- or multi-cultural.

Through previous discussions of selective perception and categorization, the students had become familiar with the fact that what one perceives from among a multitude of objects and events is selective and that how one interprets and classifies is influenced by the conventions of the culture in which one grew up. These points were reiterated by introducing theoretical concepts and by giving additional examples.

Speech sounds were used to show how culture has limited our perceptual abilities. A newborn child is a potential speaker of any language, but he will learn the language spoken around him. An American born in Korea, sur-

rounded by Korean-speaking people, will learn to speak Korean as any Korean would, while a Japanese born in Alabama will learn to speak English with a Southern drawl as any other Alabaman would. The plasticity of the brain which enables the child to learn without conscious effort any language spoken around him is lost by the time he reaches adulthood. Having heard only those speech sounds of the language spoken around him and having learned to listen to and make only those differentiations necessary in his language, he will find it difficult to hear finer differences in speech sounds that he is not accustomed to make. We are familiar with the problem that speakers of Japanese have in distinguishing between the letters *l* and *r*, with the result that *love* and *rub* or *glamor* and *grammar* are frequently pronounced in exactly the same way. Similarly, speakers of English have difficulty in hearing the difference between *obasan* and *obaasan* (Japanese kinship terms, one meaning "aunt," the other, "grandmother," but frequently used as terms of address) and consequently pronounce the two words in the same way. Usually, the one with a short vowel is used to address an adult woman (up to middle age) and the one with the long vowel to address an old woman, but, because vowel length is not a criterial attribute in English, speakers of English have difficulty in perceiving the difference in sounds. Experiments on perception of speech sounds[1] were also cited in class. The students had little difficulty understanding this point, having had sufficient exposure themselves to foreign accents and having gone through the experience of learning a foreign language in high school.

Maslow's concept of the two forces—one for safety and one for growth—was introduced to the students at this time.[2] The "never-ending series of free choice situations" was brought closer to home by giving examples from daily life situations. For instance, we tend to choose the quickest and surest way of doing things because we do not want to waste time or money. We tend to take the same route every day to work or school rather than to explore different routes occasionally which might be refreshing or might lead us into a traffic jam. When we give a child his first camera we tell him not to take just any picture but to be selective because we do not want to waste expensive color films. We follow an established routine in our daily chores so as not to waste time. Oriented to be efficient and practical, we do not allow ourselves to try new ways of accomplishing things. Repetition makes these ways habitual. In other words, the force for safety tends to win out over the force for growth.

In relation to Maslow's two concepts of safety and growth, Guilford's two

---

[1]Roger W. Brown, "Language and Categories," in Jerome S. Bruner, J.J. Goodnow, and G. A. Austin, *A Study of Thinking* (New York: John Wiley, 1956), pp. 247-312; and A.M. Liberman, Katherine S. Harris, H. S. Hoffman, and B. P. Griffith, "The Discrimination of Speech Sounds Within and Across Phoneme Boundaries," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, Vol. 54 (1957), pp. 358-368.

[2]Abraham Maslow, "Defense and Growth," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 37-38.

intellective modes were introduced.[3] The force for safety was related to convergent thinking, which "tends toward retaining the known, learning the predetermined and conserving what is," while the force for growth was related to divergent thinking, which "tends toward revising the known, exploring the undetermined, and constructing what might be." It was pointed out how the formal educational system as well as the home and social environment tend to encourage convergent thinking, as was discussed in the previous chapter. We get constant reinforcement for making the "right" judgment or "correct" prediction based on limited cues, for making logical deductions based on facts, and for behaving appropriately according to cultural expectations. In general, we do not receive the same kind of reinforcement if we deviate from others, if we use imagination rather than rational thinking or take the risk of trying something new. Within the confines of our own culture, we tend to find safety, security, and reward by following the established way. Not only do we become used to doing things in the culturally acceptable way, we also come to think that these are the only ways. In fact, it would never occur to some that alternative ways are possible. It is this blinding effect that we call cultural delimitation.

We are taught from early childhood that stealing is bad, and we teach our children the same. A teacher who has a Samoan child in her class constantly receives complaints from the other children that this child has stolen a pencil or ball or book. The teacher tells the Samoan child that it is bad to steal, and that he must stop taking other people's possessions. The child is confused and says that he is sharing these. The teacher discusses the problem with someone who knows the Samoan culture and learns that in the Samoan culture everything is shared among relatives and friends and that personal ownership is not known. The teacher explains this to the other children but it has no effect. They still maintain that taking things that belong to someone else is stealing and that is bad. What they have not discovered is that if they borrow something from the Samoan child he will not expect it to be returned. Thus, the positive aspect of the Samoan custom is overlooked. The American, resentful at having something "stolen" from him, is reacting emotionally and cannot accept the fact that this is normal behavior in Samoa. Reclassifying the Samoan child's behavior from "stealing" to "sharing" is not possible, and the behavior, as well as the child, is rejected.

It is not only in value judgments that culture tends to limit one's thinking; it is also true in approaches to solving problems. In learning to function well in our own culture, we limit the range of our behavior, our thinking, and our abilities to what is useful and functional for us.

What it Means to Learn Another Culture—Biculturality

While the previous topic focused on how biased the perspective of a monocultural person is and how culture binds the person and limits his poten-

[3] J. Paul Guilford, *Personality* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

tials, this topic emphasizes ways of overcoming the limitations imposed by one's culture and the advantages of being bicultural.

The difficulty in becoming aware of the things that one takes for granted was pointed out earlier. We need oxygen to survive, but, because it is all around us, we do not notice it until we are deprived of it. The best way to become aware of how culture-bound we are is to step out of our own culture. If we follow our customary ways in another culture, we soon find out that misunderstanding and miscommunication result. By being hurt or embarrassed as a result of these misunderstandings—by going through culture shock—we are made aware of our own cultural ways and how ingrained they are. In learning a new culture, we also learn *about* our own, which has been absorbed non-consciously and thus is taken for granted.

Students were not given detailed descriptions of the customs and values of the new culture which they were entering; they were expected to find these out for themselves. They were reminded of selectivity in perception, of how they were likely to miss certain things in the new culture unless they made conscious efforts not to screen out those attributes that are non-criterial in American culture. They were urged to try consciously to observe as much as possible without making interpretations at the beginning.

At this point, the concept of the *authoritarian personality* was introduced and related to the typically narrow monocultural person. The authoritarian person sees things in black and white; he has a strong need to categorize and pigeonhole everything and thus cannot tolerate ambiguity. He tends to be rigid and inflexible, to absolutize the values of his ingroup, and to be prejudiced toward any outgroup, whether ethnic, religious, or political. He conforms to his ingroup and does not tolerate deviants.

The creative personality, Maslow's "self-actualizing" person, stands in contrast to the authoritarian personality. The creative personality is characterized by the ability to engage freely in divergent thinking. It was pointed out in the previous chapter that our educational system, especially through standardized tests, emphasizes convergent thinking that allows for only one correct answer and tends to neglect divergent thinking. Although creativity is frequently the topic of discussion among educators and lip service is given to it, few programs are oriented toward encouraging and developing creativity among *all* students; such programs are usually reserved for exceptional children. The authors of this book hold the view that every individual is born with some degree of creativity, but that whatever creativity is there tends to be crushed in the process of going through the regular educational system with its overemphasis on convergent thinking. The conventional system of education does not provide opportunities to engage in or practice divergent thinking, which is essential to creative problem-solving.

On home ground, as we repeat the things we are sure will work smoothly or that we enjoy, we limit our range of activities and interests and become set in our ways. When the students go into a new culture, their only objective is to learn the culture on their own and they will have to explore and find out

the surest and best way to get things done according to new standards. In the process, they may discover new joys and pleasures as well as disappointments. In other words, the force for safety that makes him cling to the past has little chance of winning out over the force for growth. The students going into and trying to learn a new culture will be forced to correct their biased perceptions, at least sufficiently to recognize the significant and relevant things in the new culture. They will have to engage in divergent thinking because the conventional way of interpreting behaviors and events will not work. They will be forced to exercise the type of behavior associated with the non-authoritarian, creative personality.

By giving the students this theoretical background for the project, we prepared them for what they were to face in the field and showed them how a discomforting experience could result in personal growth. The advantages of biculturality, of not being tied to one culture, were explained in these personality terms.

Field Methodology

As already noted, the students went into the field with no professional or defined role; their only objective was to learn the culture. Each student was to keep a daily journal and there were to be weekly seminar sessions. A list of topics reflecting various roles and relationships was developed, and each student chose one or more topics in which he was particularly interested. He was cautioned not to limit his attention to this topic or to seek specific answers but to use it merely as an anchor or point of departure for explorations during the early weeks in the field. These topics were:

1. What are parents' expectations of their youth?
2. What are youth's expectations of their parents?
3. How are conflicts and disagreements handled between parent and young child? Between parent and adolescent?
4. What is the role of grandparents now in the extended family?
5. How do parents teach "role" to the female child? The male child?
6. What functions do various community groups or organizations have in the community structure?

The purpose of the discussion under field methodology was essentially to guide the students as to what to include in their journals. People going into a different culture for a short time usually go to collect data, and in order to be efficient they tend to disregard the learning of the culture. They go to see the people who can be most helpful; they read records and documents and immediately begin interviewing or asking questions in order to get as much done as possible in the short time they have. The anthropologist usually learns the language, has a general theoretical framework, and may be studying a specific topic. He usually has a year or more to make his observations, which are essentially impressionistic, of the culture. One of the tools used by anthropologists is the journal, a record based on observations and reflections. To that extent the students had something in common with anthropologists, but

the purpose of this project was quite different.

The students were encouraged to record all kinds of observations in their journals. It was pointed out to them that in the beginning one tends to notice things that are quite different, that stand in sharp contrast to one's own culture, without seeing that within the broad categories there are finer differentiations. For example, a person who goes to Japan for a brief period may be struck by the hierarchical interpersonal relationships and the hierarchy within the family without detecting the finer differences in the hierarchy itself, that is, how the status relationship is observed, whether the rules are rigid or can be relaxed, and what the differences are among classes and between rural and urban areas. Toward the end of the period of conscious learning, however, selectivity in perception is likely to change and the student will be able to make finer differentiations.

In a certain culture, for instance, gratitude may be expressed in such a way that the newcomer notices it. Later he may learn that what he thought was one type of behavior was actually two which were outwardly much alike, but until he became aware of certain nuances he had no way of knowing that one was an expression of gratitude and the other an apology. Obviously, the students' journals will change over a period of time as they learn the cues and perceive the nuances.

At first, one may take the behavior of women in a new culture as showing deference to men, thereby implying that men have higher status. But how does one know when persons of another culture are showing respect? When one watches two people interacting, how can one tell which has the higher status? How does one judge the status relationship? Then there is "aggressive behavior," so familiar in social work terminology. Beating children, administering physical punishment rather than reprimand—is that aggressive behavior? Behavior that, to a person from the United States, seems cruelty—is it really cruelty or is it a routine way of behaving in the other culture? One cannot interpret behavior in a new culture. So, instead of writing in the journal "Women show extreme deference to their husbands," it is better to describe exactly how the women behave in relation to their husbands. The same applies in the case of a parent punishing a child, or of two children who appear to be fighting. The parent may be doing only what all parents in that culture do, and the children may be playing. It is obvious, then, that in the early period of learning the student should not categorize or interpret. He should describe in deatil, and only when he has seen the same type of behavior over and over again should he begin to interpret. At first, one tends to see behavior as unique to a given person rather than as cultural. Later, as a pattern emerges, it becomes clearer which behavior is unique to a person and which is cultural. Until the student can identify the pattern he should keep an open mind. The students were told that their journals should reflect these changes in impressions, should show that at first they thought the behavior meant one thing but it turned out to mean another.

How members of the new culture behave toward the newcomer is usually

complicated. For example, the variations in the way of saying yes and the meaning of each variation cannot be understood easily by the outsider. Furthermore, the very fact of one's being an outsider may cause the person with whom he is interacting to change his pattern of behavior. We all know that many people non-consciously use a different voice over the telephone. If one alters one's behavior in this interaction, how much more may he do so in face-to-face encounter! The status as a student from the University of Hawaii tended to have some effect initially and probably enforced the "guest" status. It takes time and effort on the part of the student to get beyond this.

Asking questions usually results in "supposed-to" answers. The question, "What do you call your mother or your father?" is apt to be answered not in terms of what the person actually does but in terms of what he is supposed to call them. Thus, questions that seek information are usually not very satisfactory; however, questions that grow out of an interest in what the other is saying or doing—questions that simply show an interest in the other person—will help develop interaction.

Direct questions may be answered by what the person thinks the asker wants to hear. Americans need to develop sensitivity to indirect communication, to indirect answers and non-verbal communication. Hearing in the frame of reference of the other culture, reading facial expressions, and discovering other cues require conscious training. It takes time, and even when one thinks he has recognized a cue, it may turn out to have a totally different meaning.

Sometimes a person's attitude will be expressed in his written record without his being aware of it. Suppose he makes the assumption on a non-conscious level that something in the new culture is primitive, that is, primitive in relation to some standard he has in mind. The implication from what he writes in his journal is that his own culture is better than the new one. It takes tremendous effort to become aware of one's real attitudes.

Some years ago, great emphasis was placed on standard English pronunciation in the public schools of Hawaii and at the University. The use of pidgin English and local intonations was abhorred. The attitude toward those who spoke pidgin was, "The language you speak is a low-prestige language." This resulted in alienating the students who spoke in these ways and creating resistance. It also resulted in a feeling of inferior status.

This kind of attitude—which is, essentially, being critical of any class or ethnic group—is bound to be noticed and resented. It makes no difference that the attitude is non-conscious; it is still condescending and will create resistance in the new culture. It takes a conscious desire and effort to recognize and change this attitude to "You know and I know your culture is different from mine. I want to learn yours. Will you try to learn mine?"

This was one of the field tasks, this learning to notice our non-conscious assumptions, behavior, and habits and at the same time to examine them and try to remove as much of the value orientation as possible. We were trying to rid ourselves of the-way-we-do-things-is-better-than-the-way-you-do-things attitude. This change can take place as one begins to understand behavior and

habits as part of a total pattern and to recognize that the way someone does something—which at first seems primitive or less good—may actually be the best way in that particular culture and even a good way for others to consider.

We discussed the need to learn to communicate in the frame of reference of the other culture. Often in cross-cultural studies hypotheses are developed by Westerners and measures for the data are set in terms of Western culture. Frequently, however, the measures chosen, though important in the Western culture, are not so important in the other culture. The findings, therefore, do not reflect very much of the new culture.

When one assumes universality or assumes that people should place a certain value on some particular behavior or habit, such as openness or frankness, it often happens that one ends up measuring something that is not even there. Because one is looking for something, it is generally found, but whether or not what is found is an important ingredient of the other culture is open to question.

In the hierarchy of values, certain things high in one culture may be low in another. This difference is more complex than just the presence of similarities or differences. The hierarchy of values becomes very important when conflicts arise. Which value comes first? Does honesty come before hurting another person? Is a smooth interpersonal relationship more important than honesty? In Samoa, harmony is important. In America, the achievement motive in competition is very high. This would be frowned upon in the Samoan hierarchy. It cannot be said that one is right and one is wrong. Both may be good in context.

General Preparatory Sessions

One session of the pre-training seminar was devoted to the general background of Guam, and this material is summarized in the next chapter. Some topics were expanded and discussed over a two-week period. A final session was devoted to review, questions and answers, and preparatory arrangements for departure to Guam.

The general learning objectives of the pre-training seminar were not fully achieved and recognized by the students until later. By the end of the seminar the students had some knowledge, some theory, an attitude of sensitivity, an intellectual readiness for uncertainty but anxiety about themselves in relation to uncertainty, and an *intellectual* tolerance for unstructured responses to their specific questions about the Guamanian culture. Intellectually, they knew that the instructors were trying to help them avoid preconceptions and a "mental set" before going into the new culture, but actually this lack of structure was difficult for them to handle.

From time to time during the pre-training seminar, some students would ask questions or make comments such as the following: "What does this topic have to do with culture learning?" or "This is interesting but I don't see how it relates to culture learning," or "Maybe we shouldn't spend all this time in preparation, maybe we should just go into the other culture." Sometimes the

students were reacting to the selection of materials or the method of presentation; at other times the questions were related to the learning phenomena. The instructors conferred weekly for purposes of assessment and correction.

In the light of the experience of other pre-training programs conducted by various organizations, the instructors were not surprised with the immediate learning results of this seminar. Sanders relates his experience with a pre-training program in 1953, when he spoke with section chiefs of a USAID mission in Greece about the social characteristics of rural people. A number of the chiefs said they would have been more effective if they had known the truth of what he was saying before they arrived in Greece; however, they agreed that they would not have appreciated the truth of such a talk before their first foreign assignment. Dr. Sanders describes a similar situation in 1968, when a group of fellows in agriculture, engineering, veterinary science, and industrial management returned from internships in Latin America. They agreed that the social and cultural differences they encountered were far greater than they had assumed they would be. They further agreed, however, that they had been impatient with efforts in their pre-departure program to provide such background.[4]

Personal freedom is highly valued in American culture. The students would have certain freedoms during their stay in Guam—particularly freedom from the expectations of their families and friends, expectations that are quite significant in regard to behavior and habits—but there would be restrictions. Trying to learn another culture and not knowing what to do in a number of situations restricts behavior. In a new situation with different facilities, certain habits have to be altered or broken. At home, most of the students take a car and go where they wish when they wish. In Guam, with no public transportation and only two cars for the six students, it was necessary to make many joint decisions.

One student brought out the difference between the kind of thinking encouraged in this project and that emphasized in research projects. Normally the emphasis in research is on structure and categorization; in this project, classification was avoided and interpretation delayed until a pattern emerged. It was pointed out that this is *not* research. This kind of learning is intended to be different. Aside from learning a culture other than one's own, one learns that interpretation of behavior, habits, and ways of doing things can be made only in the cultural context and not in absolute terms. The journals were expected to reflect this type of learning.

Integration Seminar

The follow-up seminar in the fall was called the "Integration Seminar" because the purpose was the integration of affective learning from the field experience and the cognitive learning from the pre-training seminar. It offered

---

[4]Irwin T. Sanders, *Professional Education for World Responsibility* (New York: Educational and World Affairs, 1968), fn. p. 13.

an opportunity to re-examine and reinterpret learning experiences at some distance from both. It was assumed that, to the extent that the emotional bias had been removed, the reinterpretation would be more objective and perspective would stand out more clearly. It was hoped that this re-examination and reinterpretation would add to the students' perspectives as well as provide a vehicle for integration of learning and, to some extent, for conceptualization. It also offered an opportunity for students to tell whether or not they were using their learning in their regular field practicum and, if so, how they were using it.

The early sessions were devoted to recall of the pre-training period. These were followed by sessions of re-examination and reinterpretation of the students' learning, both in personal growth and non-specific cultural learning, and included some practice in divergent thinking. During the final sessions there was some formulation of the learning. One group developed and made a presentation of their learning to the faculty of the School of Social Work; the other group identified central ideas for possible inclusion in the social work curriculum. Both groups discussed ideas for improvement, change, and so on, which are incorporated in the final chapter here.

Throughout the seminar, statements and discussions by the students affirmed some of the ideas that, according to Bruner,[5] emerged from the Woods Hole Conference. Bruner speaks of discovery as a significant and exciting ingredient of learning. This project emphasized discovery. Bruner speaks of non-specific learning as the basis for action in subsequent situations and of the "connectedness of things." Without understanding the structure—the connectedness of specifics—these specifics remain isolated and we are unable to use them in thinking beyond the situation. The project provided minimum specific structure in the learning situation but, as a whole, it provided fundamental structure for learning the connectedness of things. The integration seminar appeared to be especially useful for this purpose.

[5]Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961).

Chapter IV

EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

We regard experiential learning as the core in culture learning. Both cognitive and affective learning are involved; actually a unity of the two is sought in the "internalization process [which] represents a continuous modification of behavior from the individual's being aware of a phenomenon to a pervasive outlook on life that influences all his actions."[1] This is the usual process, but the process of learning a second culture appears to be qualitatively different. It appears to involve not only learning to make finer differentiations in formerly undifferentiated wholes (i.e., to make continuous modifications) but also being sufficiently shaken up to recognize that certain previously learned role behavior differentiations are not useful and must be ignored or forgotten in order to learn new role behavior differentiations. New differentiations must also be learned within the context of different basic attributes organized in a different way.

An illustration of this need to ignore the old learning if one is to become involved in learning new differentiations is the situation of the parent who wants to help his children with their homework but cannot because he does not know the basic attributes of the new ways of teaching reading, or spelling, or the "new math." Experiential learning in a culture different from one's own forces one to ignore and forget old patterns of differentiation and to engage in learning new ones. This ego-involving experience requires considerable risk to one's self esteem.

In 1967, Harrison and Hopkins, writing about goals of cross-cultural learning, said the learner must not only "solve new problems in a new setting, but

[1]David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, Bertram B. Masia, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain* (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956), p. 33.

he must develop a new learning style, quite on his own. This experience—not knowing how to learn without traditional supports—may be productive of a good deal of anxiety and depression grouped under the rubric culture shock." They go on to say that "if the trainee can be educated to be an effective and independent learner he need not be filled with all the information he can contain before going into his new job. . . . He will have the capacity to generate his own learning as needed."[2]

Harrison and Hopkins suggest that another dimension in cross-cultural learning is "the extent to which the emotions, values, and deeper aspects of the self are actively involved, touched, and changed in the learning process." They point out that it is not possible to maintain "emotional distance from the sights, the smells, the sounds, and the customs of an alien culture." The supportive aspects of one's own culture are absent; this is emotionally disruptive, and "one's assumptions and values are called into question again and again by the most trivial kinds of events. The interpersonal competencies that work well in one's own cultures suddenly do not work any more. The cues are different. One can avoid the encounter only by retreating into some kind of physical or emotional enclave, into the kinds of American compounds that wall off Yankees from natives all over the world."[3]

An important objective in this cross-cultural learning is the development of the ability and willingness to take some "emotional risks in situations where his sense of self-esteem is involved." Harrison and Hopkins proposed a concept of moderate risk-taking:

> Low-risk alternatives might include withdrawal from the relationship or resort to written rather than oral communication. High-risk alternatives might include retaliation with some kind of personal attack. . . . The low- and high-risk approaches allow the causes of the situation to remain unknown and not dealt with. They are designed more to ease the tension and uncertainty than to solve the problem.[4]

The moderate-risk approach involves willingness to increase tension in order to obtain information about the situation. Moderate-risk approaches "require more ability to stand emotional tension over a period of time than do the others."

The moderate-risk approach was used in this project. The ability to learn independently and the willingness to risk oneself in experience appear to be interdependent components in the development of one's own creativity, as the term is used here. This type of cross-cultural learning is transferable and the participants can be expected to deal with the ambiguities and uncertainties of living and working in any situation.

---

[2]Roger Harrison and Richard L. Hopkins, "The Design of Cross Cultural Training: An Alternative to the University Model," *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. III, No. 4 (1967), p. 439. Harrison was at that time a consultant in organization development, education, and training and evaluation research in Washington, D.C. Hopkins, former director of the Peace Corps Training Center in Puerto Rico, was general manager, Government Division, Instructional Services Group, Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Bladensburg, Maryland.

[3]*Ibid.*, p. 440.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 441.

Design of the Cultural Field Experience

The field learning experience was designed with the idea of developing a new style of learning. The broad goals for a student were to learn to communicate with people of another culture on their own ground (which implies learning the culture) and, in the process, to develop an awareness of his own cultural frame of reference and behavior, to develop his own creativity in communication, ways of seeing situations, solving problems, and so on, and to move toward biculturality, that is, toward the kind of learning that could be transferred for use in various other cultural or subcultural situations.

Some of the assumptions underlying the project design were:

1. Culture shock is an essential ingredient of culture learning; while it can be damaging to the individual if he is so unprepared as to find the shock traumatic, it can, in smaller doses, be an effective instrument of learning in that it appears to shake the individual out of his own cultural frame of mind.
2. It is the emotional experience (involvement of the ego) of some of our successes in functioning and failures in committing cultural errors that makes the learning from living in another culture different from learning *about* the culture through lectures, books, films, and simulated exercises.
3. Other people's expectations of us make the process of "breaking the habit" more difficult; therefore, being with or having access to family or friends tends to reinforce habits, customary ways of behaving, values, even our own expectations of ourselves.
4. An equal status relationship with people of the other culture is an important ingredient in the kind of learning that is projected.
5. Development of one's creativity depends to some extent on opportunities to try and to risk oneself in uncertain or ambiguous situations.
6. Some supports are needed for functioning in an unstructured, ambiguous, strange situation.
7. The students and the project should make some contribution to the people of the other culture.

The Field Plan

On the basis of the above assumptions, the following plan for field learning was developed for the two groups of students who went to Guam:

1. A learning site would be selected that created (a) cultural distance from the student's own way of living so that the attitudes and values that had guided his behavior would not be adequate in the new setting, and (b) geographical distance so that the student would be required to learn without the traditional supports of his own culture and would, therefore, reduce the reinforcement of his own culture through association with friends and family.

2. Arrangements and procedures for the introduction of the student into the setting of the second culture were to be developed jointly with appropriate people in the second culture and were to be in accordance with the pattern of the culture.

3. The student would have some orientation to people but would develop

his own learning experience, i.e., he would devise his own approaches and find his own solutions.

4. The student would have no specific role except that as a learner. Professional students usually have roles which place them, from the start, in an unequal relationship status with people of the new culture. In the field experience, the student would be a learner without the usual prop of a role, except the status of being a university student but not a student who was doing research or making a survey. He would be a participant in the activities of the people in order to learn the culture but not to bring about any changes. He would be engaged in problem-solving only in himself and could not impose his own values (except by virtue of his presence in the other culture). He would have only himself to give and to use in interaction and in developing relationships with people in all sectors of the population.

5. The length of the field learning period—eight weeks—was set more or less arbitrarily for practical reasons. This period was considered the minimum learning time required to achieve the objectives, and it was believed that ten weeks would have been better.

Various supports were built into the plan:

1. A regular weekly seminar provided students with an opportunity to discuss frustrations, misunderstandings, uncertainties; to explore and reflect upon cultural ideas; and to examine together, in a general cultural context, their ideas about their learning.

2. The social work instructor accompanied the students. Her responsibilities were to help the students make learning conscious; to encourage them to experiment, to take risks, to try and fail and try again, and to see failure as an important aspect of the learning; to assist them in exploring and identifying possible generalizations; to provide a channel for the positive use of frustrating and confusing experiences and for the development of ideas; and to use local personnel to help the students clarify ideas.

3. A list of topics was provided from which each student could choose one or more as a point of entry into the new culture, an idea to be kept in mind. It was believed this would be especially helpful during the initial period, when demands on the student were heaviest. (The list of topics is given in Chapter III, p. 29.)

It was hoped that the people of the other culture would find their relationships and friendships with the students rewarding, that through these associations they would sense our respect for them—for their values and way of life as different from our own—and thus affirm for themselves richnesses in their culture. It was also hoped that some of the students' cultural insights might be useful for the local social agencies to examine in relation to their services and programs.

The plan for the field learning experience, therefore, emphasized ambiguity as a requisite for the kind of learning sought—ambiguity in the situation because the students did not know the culture and did not know how to act, and ambiguity in role, because they had no prop in the form of a defined role.

The learning at first, then, was to develop the ability to cope with ambiguity and to act, in a manner acceptable to others, in the absence of full knowledge on the basis of bits of information that were often conflicting.

Choice of Experiential Learning Site

Considerations in selecting the site included language, distance from home environment, and cultural difference or cultural distance. If the two cultures were fairly similar, the finer distinctions or differentiations would not be noticed and the student would have the feeling that he already knows everything. On the other hand, if the cultures were too different, eight weeks would not be time enough for learning. Guam was selected because it is sufficiently different from middle-class American culture to provide some culture-shock effect. It is a non-Western culture, although aspects of Americanized modernization are felt there in the military presence, the government, the educational system, and the economic situation. Chamorro is the first language, but most Guamanians speak English as a second language. Guam is seven hours by air from Hawaii—far enough away to preclude home culture and environmental reinforcements. The Guam Department of Public Health and Social Services was pleased to give us official sanction.

Background Information about Guam

Polynesia, Micronesia, and Melanesia are the three major culture areas of the Pacific. Guam, as part of the Marianas chain of islands, falls within the Micronesian area. The boundaries among the cultures in this area are not precise, and there is a great deal of overlap. Earlier all three culture areas contained relatively small-scale societies that derived their livelihood primarily from subsistence farming and were organized mainly on the basis of relationship by blood and marriage.[5] Guam, which is about 30 miles long and varies from five to nine miles in width, is the largest island in the North Pacific between Hawaii and the Philippines, and between Japan and the islands near New Guinea. It lies within the tropics. The southern part of the island is high and mountainous; the northern part, where the United States military reservation is, is high plateau.

The Guamanians represent many ethnic strains. According to Thompson:

> Little is known about the origin of the ancient Chamorros, remote ancestors of the present-day Guamanians. Limited information that is available seems to indicate that they were a Malaysian people who came originally from Southeast Asia. It is believed that they might have been expert seamen who migrated slowly, in canoes, from Asia to the Philippines and the Western Carolines. From there, they moved eastward to Guam and the Marianas.[6]

Coates, however, writes of the prehistoric Austronesian civilization of

---

[5]R. G. Crocombe, *The New South Pacific* (Wellington: Reed Education, Division of A. H. and A.W. Reed, Ltd., 1973), p. 10.

[6]Laura Thompson, *Guam and Its People* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1947), p. 30.

Pacific origin, which seems to have reached its zenith around 3500 B.C., prior to the First Dynasty of Egypt. He says:

> At some unknown date, not later than 3500 B.C., large numbers of people from the Pacific, skilled in navigation and astronomy, came westward into Asia, driven by population pressure, at a time when China and India were inland civilizations, having nowhere a coastline. The people of South-East Asia have an important strain of Pacific ancestry. . . . The Pacific, in fact, supplied one of the major elements which has made Asia what it is today.[7]

Thompson's view is probably better known than Coates's, but the matter of origin remains ambiguous.

Guam was conquered and ruled by the Spaniards from 1668 to 1898, when it was captured by the United States and held as a possession under naval administration until taken by the Japanese in 1941, at the beginning of World War II. It was retaken by the United States in 1944. The Organic Act of 1950 provided for civil government but placed the island under the administrative supervision of the U.S. Department of the Interior. For almost three hundred years Guam has been under outside rule. Although many people thought that the local cultures in the Pacific could not survive the tremendous changes, they actually are very much alive today—not the pre-contact cultures, perhaps, but still distinctive cultures. Crocombe points to Guam as the most extreme example in the Pacific of the persistence of aspects of indigenous culture. Although Guam was dominated for several centuries by Spain, Japan, and the United States, a Guamanian culture and the Chamorro language still exist.

The villages in Guam, in the areas where the students concentrated primarily, are self-contained in the sense of being somewhat closed. For example, a Guamanian friend of ours was not acquainted with the young woman her brother married because the girl was from another village only two miles away.

Guam is Catholic, and the church plays an important role in the village. Many community social activities are connected with the church, and the parish priest, like the village commissioner, is significant in the lives of the people.

Fiestas, a common form of socializing, may be given for the patron saint of a village, or to celebrate some family occasion. The fandango, the special wedding feast, as well as christenings, engagements, birthdays, and graduation feasts are all means of socializing. Plans for the event, including the preparation of the food (men and women have different responsibilities here), arranging the tents and tables, and cooking the pig, are all done on a reciprocal help basis, and, although they are hard work, they are also fun. A dozen or more women may work together all night, with occasional time out for coffee and betel nut, and have a thoroughly enjoyable time. The men work together

---

[7]Austin Coates, *Islands of the South* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, Ltd., 1974), p. 4.

in the same way. A bona fide invitation to a fiesta is considered an obligation. A family need not go at any certain time, but if someone is invited and does not appear sometime during the fiesta it is considered an insult.

Harmonious, close human relationships have high—perhaps first—priority among Guamanians. If a relative, neighbor, or friend needs help, this may take priority over work.

Since World War II, there has been little agriculture and most foods are imported. The United States Air Force base is important to the economy, and tourism is also becoming important. Government is a major source of employment.

Getting Started in Guam

Original plans and agreements were made a year before the arrival in Guam of the first student group. Final arrangements were made two months in advance of their arrival. In the planning, two principles were observed: (1) decision-making was shared by the Guamanians and the project director (the social work instructor), and (2) the advice of the Guamanians was sought in developing plans for student living and for ways of introducing the students to the people and into the villages.

The decision that students would live in the dormitories at the University of Guam was reached after considering such questions as: Would it be more profitable for learning if the students lived with families? Would a combination be good, say, living with a family for a week or two midway through the eight-week period? Might the students rent a place to live and do their own cooking, or would this have the effect of isolating them (the very thing we did not want to happen), and would this be acceptable to the culture? The Guamanians held the view that because of certain characteristic patterns in their culture, a student living with a family would always be treated as a guest, and the family behavior thus would not follow the usual pattern. Staying on a paying basis would create another barrier, yet most families could not assume the added financial responsibility even though they might wish to do so. Also, if the student lived with a family, he would be more or less restricted to the activities of the immediate neighborhood because there is no public transportation in Guam. Renting a place to live and doing their own cooking would not be practical, probably would not be acceptable, and might prove to be counter-productive. The idea of living for a week or so with a family was left open, but the Guamanians thought this should be a spontaneous happening rather than a planned affair. These spontaneous opportunities did occur for some of the students; they were invited to stay a night or two to help prepare for a fiesta or some other celebration, or to go fishing.

In the Guamanian culture it is important to know about the outsider, why he is there, what he will do, who he is. The Guamanians want to see him and to know that the village commissioner and the various organizations, institutions, and agencies have accepted his presence. This is the first step in opening the door to a type of interaction different from that with tourists. Also,

Guamanians are somewhat wary, perhaps even a bit resentful, at being used by Westerners or others for "survey and research." This attitude is strong, and even though it was made plain that the students were not there to make a survey or do research but to try to understand the culture and become friends with them, Guamanians continued during the first several weeks to introduce the first group of participants as "students doing research." This attitude was reinforced by the fact that, at first, the students tended to ask questions rather than to observe, listen, and respond.

The Guam Department of Public Health and Social Services gave us their official sanction in the form of a memorandum of understanding, provided space as needed in one of their district offices for students to meet each other, and helped us to make plans involving other organizations and groups. Workers in the Department, including some of the secretarial staff, introduced students to friends, relatives, and sometimes client families.

The administrator, the aides, and some of the teachers in the Head Start Program provided students with opportunities to see young children in their formalized activities and to attend Closing Day ceremonies. In this way, the students' presence in Guam became known to the parents as well. The Head Start aides took students with them on their registration visits to families, thus acquainting them with various villages and the countryside and giving them an opportunity to learn how Guamanians work with families in this kind of activity.

The director and supervisors of the Community Action Agency arranged to have the students accompany their workers on various visits and tasks and introduced them to the families of friends and relatives in the villages.

The director and staff of Youth Hall[8] offered the students continuing opportunities to help with and participate in the program activities of the youth, to visit with them, and to develop relationships.

Help was also given by the elected village commissioners, whose duties were prescribed in the Code of the Government of Guam. In the past, the commissioner was regarded and used by the families of a village as a father-counselor-arbitrator-planner-organizer. (This is still true in a number of villages, and was the case in all the villages where the students spent their time.) As one commissioner said, "We take care of almost everything in the village. Too many responsibilities and too little authority." But, for the families, he carries village authority. Guamanian workers from various organizations and agencies usually stop at the commissioner's office when they expect to be in a given village—sometimes to get information, sometimes to give information or to make a plan—but always to let him know they are in the village.

As noted earlier, the parish priest also has a place of importance. Sometimes he and the commissioner share responsibilities.

---

[8]Youth Hall is a rambling open facility for youth considered by their parents as "out of control." The meaning of "out of control" in Guam is very different from that in Hawaii, as will be described later.

Without the blessing of the village commissioners in the districts where the students finally concentrated there would have been little possibility of the students becoming integrated into the villages. Several commissioners found ways for the students to participate in community activities and to develop relationships with families and youth.

So far, we have discussed the supports provided for the students—the weekly seminar, the instructor, the point-of-entry topic, and the ways in which the village commissioners and the Guamanians in the various agencies helped them to be accepted. Another support was the fact that the students lived together in one place and had the opportunity to release tensions among themselves.

As was to be expected, these intended supports were not always regarded as such. Sometimes one or another of the supports became a basis of frustration, but, in retrospect, it would be true to say that generally they were recognized and appreciated as supports. This, then, was the *learning situation*. We turn now to the *learning process*.

The Learning Process

One purpose of this chapter is to make available for educators a student account of this field experience—the development of a new style of learning and the achievement of personal development in the process of learning another culture.

The authors felt that the students' own accounts would engender more pertinent questions and ideas in the minds of educators than merely an interpretive summary "sifted" through the authors' frames of reference. Selection of illustrative student material means, of course, that some sifting has occurred. The illustrations reflect the recurring dominant patterns, themes, observations, reactions, feelings, and experiences, but comments are also included to point up variations. Material from the students' journals is presented separately from that of the field seminar to show how the two types of activity complemented each other.

Analysis of the journals and tapes of the field seminar revealed a pattern of shifts and changes in the learning process that seemed to divide roughly into four stages. The first stage, of just over two weeks for most students, was characterized by what might be called disorganization; the second stage, approximately a week, was one of re-examination and reflection; the third stage (fourth and fifth weeks, spilling over into the sixth) seemed to be one of reorganization; and the last stage (sixth through eighth week) was characterized by the emergence of new perspectives.

The First Stage: Disorganization

The students related to many people during these two weeks as a means of getting acquainted with the geography of the island, learning the network of social institutions, such as the family, church, and community, and so on. From this scheduled but relatively unstructured orientation to interaction with

people, they developed, as best they could, means for their learning.

Expressions of their frustration included annoyance, even irritation and exasperation for some, as well as confusion and puzzlement, as will be evident from the quotations from the journals. There was, of course, some variation among students in the degree of expressed frustration and in its source; there were also many positive expressions regarding people they had met, or "this week was a rich experience," or "the sunsets are sheer celebrations."

Decisions, large or small, were difficult for the students; sometimes they were annoyed with each other because they could not reach decisions. To their surprise, they learned that they did not know each other although they had been in the pre-training seminar together for a semester. The task of getting to know one another and developing at least some interdependence in this new situation in which each was uncertain of himself was not easy. The loss of independence created by having to share transportation (two cars for six people going to several different locations and no public transportation) was an initial source of frustration for all except one student who had not been accustomed to this independence. An additional demand for all except two students was learning to live in a dormitory with a roommate from another culture.

The reactions of most of the students to cultural situations involving differing values tended to be extreme and were usually expressed negatively, since they were reacting in terms of their own cultural values and ways. All the students appeared to experience a temporary loss of self-esteem because their usual ways of behaving did not work. Again, there was variation in the expressions of this sense of loss.

Although not always articulated as such, the situation of being without an instrumental role appeared to be a significant factor in a sense of inadequacy which was reflected in students' comments and in their tendency to rely heavily during this period on the "topic" they had selected—a topic not to work on but to have in mind to provide a point of departure from time to time in their observations.

Journals

The journals were primarily descriptive during this period but they also reflected a range of reactions which largely fall into categories such as physical discomfort, personal discomfort in one's self and the occurrences deriving from one's interactions, reactions to the ways of the new culture, and cultural observations.

Physical discomfort

The emotional importance to us of physical comfort is evident in the first reactions of students to a different environment:

> There is no hot water, no keys for the rooms, and the bathrooms are not clean, but the thing that really bothers me is the washer being out of order. The rest seems minor tonight, but little things can grow on you.

• • • •

I am repulsed by the condition of the washrooms . . . and some of our rooms need much cleaning.

Red ants are everywhere, walls, floor, ceiling. Can I get used to all the bugs and ants?

Annoyance with lack of services to which they were accustomed was noted:

The telephone system is a nuisance; it is almost non-existent. There is no mail pick-up time posted on any mail boxes on campus; the postal service on campus is sporadic and, unbelievably, the main Guam post office [there is no mail delivery in Guam] ran out of stamps!

A few students found the food "hot and spicy" and had "to wash it down with water." Another said, "I distrust the food and water; I'm sure I'm going to be sick." One student noted enjoyment of a food that was familiar: "Delicious food at the 'X' closing program, soft chocolate-flavored rice."

Personal discomfort

During this period some students wrote of a sense of discomfort within themselves that appeared to be related to being in this kind of situation:

Tired, and I am not comfortable. I hope this feeling will diminish.

• • • •

Had lunch at P.'s, mostly Haoles [statesiders]. This is the first time in several days that I have felt comfortable and certain of what I was doing.

Others identified sources of discomfort:

The first week's seminar was loose and I think we didn't say what we are feeling.

• • • •

I am frustrated because I can't put things together to make patterns. We are invited to many fiestas and celebrations but I don't yet see these as valuable since we talk mostly among ourselves.

• • • •

I felt guilty when J. talked about the meaning of food. I have been eating out of gluttony and hunger, but here food means communion, bestowal, and acceptance.

Several students experienced ethnic discomfort:

I felt uneasy when A. told T. I am Japanese. I thought there was some negative feeling in his tone of voice, and I have never felt so uneasy regarding my ethnic background.

• • • •

Children politely ask me whether I am Japanese and then walk away. Two people made an issue of my being Japanese and related horrible stories of the Occupation. I could not help feeling very uncomfortable.

• • • •

At the shopping center I [a Caucasian] was conscious of looking different from most people. Few people smiled, and I felt they see me as an outsider who might be trying to impose stress-provoking aspects of my culture.

• • • •

I tried to get a salt shaker so I could be sprinkled with salt, the Japanese way, to keep the dead spirits away after viewing the funeral. This may sound strange but this was passed down by my parents and I do not choose to challenge the tradition.

Journal entries that involve interactions reflect the pervasiveness of discom-

fort arising from not knowing how to behave and not understanding meanings, as well as of taking risks and finding they have made mistakes:

> I am uncomfortable because I can't understand, I'm not sure about things and can't communicate effectively. Very frustrating.
>
> • • • •
>
> It is difficult for us to interact with others because we tend to sit together and stay together as a group.
>
> • • • •
>
> We made a mistake by going to the reception at K's. The invitation was not really for us and we missed the cues. I don't understand the cues about invitations. I think we were considered outsiders at the J. party.
>
> • • • •
>
> Made a mistake I think. My roommate offered me a can of dessert pudding. I was busy writing and declined. He looked disappointed.
>
> • • • •
>
> At the fiesta I walked to the back where two girls from our group were talking to a group of men. The Guamanian women looked at me as I passed and I became uncomfortable. I think we shouldn't have been there.
>
> • • • •
>
> I feel quite panicky about talking with people. In spite of knowing that I must make the first move I can't do it right now even when I have good openings. Worries me.
>
> • • • •
>
> The session with I. brought home that we are in a different culture and we can't read the messages. I can certainly see how easily misunderstandings occur—confusing and frustrating.

Reactions to ways of new culture

The Guamanian concept of time, which is different from ours, was a matter of annoyance during this period. The students could not seem to get beyond this:

> Today is hurry up and wait, wait, wait.
>
> • • • •
>
> I am very annoyed and irritated at all the delays for everything—room, keys, cars—thought everything had been planned.
>
> • • • •
>
> The Guamanian concept of time is so strange. So wasteful and inefficient. Will I ever get used to the lax attitude about keeping appointments?

During this period the students spoke of feeling exhausted at the end of each day and two expressed it for all:

> Stayed in all day [the end of the first week]; tired. Adjusting to the food, heat, and new culture seems to have given most of us one or another physical symptom (upset stomach, headache, skin rash, and so on).

From time to time the students noted that they had only bits and pieces and could make nothing from the fragments. In summing up at the end of the second week, one student wrote:

> I think I am beginning to understand a little of Guamanian culture. Sometimes I am too tired to be observant. Never knew it could take so much energy. May already be taking some things for granted. Have to watch this. Find I am writing less of what I observe and becoming more reflective. Is this a feature of beginning to understand or a blasé attitude? My

observations are becoming less haphazard. It takes a couple of days to turn my observations into useful reflections.

Another said:

The purpose of our being here fell into place for me today. Now I feel a definite direction in our presence and involvement [second week].

Cultural observations

(The reader is cautioned that throughout this book both students and authors recognize that the students' ideas and formulations regarding the new culture may be inaccurate or reflect misunderstanding of all the dimensions involved.) Observations, ideas, and questions about Guamanian culture were fragments, but they ranged across quite a number of Hall's primary message systems[9] and can be so organized. The students did not make such an organization and the various topics were separate from each other. They were not seen as parts of a larger whole and connections were not made. Some were stated as contrasts to their own cultural frame of reference.

Toward the end of the two-week period, one student said, "At this point there seems to be no one Guamanian way." Another said, "From talking with B. we began to get a feel for the variations and complexities of the culture."

Time, Appointments. From the very beginning, the Guamanian concept of time proved to be elusive and a source of frustration for students whose concept of time is segmental.

I don't understand why people say they will be on time and either don't come or arrive late.

• • • •

What does it mean when people say yes and/or make an appointment and don't keep it? How can we pick up cues as to when a person is really going to do what he says and when not?

• • • •

Maybe when people make an appointment for a certain time it is because they think it is what we want and do not consider it rude to break it, although it might be rude to refuse to make it.

Interaction/Communication. Interaction and communication overlap at times with ideas about relationships. The observations are fairly scattered and connections among the observations are not yet noted. At the same time, one notes that the students have recognized some of the more subtle aspects of Guamanian communication even though they do not understand them.

Introductions seem important for outsiders. People seem to open up and become more friendly if they know who you are and why you are here. A. said "My people don't know you well yet. They will be friendlier when they do."

• • • •

[9]Edward T. Hall, *The Silent Language* (New York: Fawcett World Library, 1959).

G. didn't tell me there is only one key to a room. Why? Do Guamanians not tell a person what they know he doesn't want to hear?

• • • •

People seem not to take initiative in conversations. Is this part of a concept of no disagreements, no confrontations, but smooth interpersonal relationships?

• • • •

A Guamanian [I'm told] hates to have anyone say no or turn him down. This is considered an insult.

• • • •

I asked a woman how Guamanians say no and she didn't answer until I asked several times; then she said, "Do you mean a definite no?" Does this mean there are various ways?

• • • •

I am impressed with the hospitality of people. They place high priority on giving and sharing.

• • • •

The aide stayed at each home to chat a bit. I am U.S. business- and time-oriented—here it is people that are important.

• • • •

Guamanians are very social people. They like visiting each other, picnics, and so on. All special events are occasions for a celebration. Fiestas and celebrations are important. They give family and friends opportunities to get together and have fun. Reciprocal giving is involved (perhaps obligations also). Other forms of entertainment are limited.

• • • •

Is there community identification rather than class identification? Maybe Guamanians don't think particularly in terms of class.

Family. Students' observations and impressions about family are stated mostly as contrasts with their own concepts of family.

Children generally seem to be a joy rather than a burden. People like large families and children appear to get a great deal of attention, not all of it from the mother, but from many family members.

• • • •

At an early age girls carry household responsibilities and older children learn early and appear to accept the fact that they are responsible for younger children.

• • • •

Family is important and close. Young married couples often live with parents at first and then have homes on the same property.

• • • •

Guamanians show respect for older people, kiss the hand, and respect the wisdom of years. They enjoy older people and care for them. A Sunday visit to the grandparents' home is fun. Children are enjoyed and shared with all the family.

• • • •

The mother appears to discipline and punish children except for a very serious situation and then she may ask the father's help. Children are punished physically more often than in the United States. Some Guamanians say "statesiders do not understand the Guamanian method of punishment but it is good."

• • • •

Parents seem to be more permissive than in the U.S. with respect to noisy children; they may make a verbal reprimand but if the behavior is not serious, it continues and the mother lets it go. Children appear to be punished, however, for disobedience.

• • • •

The mother appears to handle the money and make day-to-day decisions.

• • • •

How are roles taught? This is not clear yet.

Youth and Dating. Students became aware early of a different type of parental practice with respect to dating, and a visit to Youth Hall added to their interest:

How do young people meet each other and decide they want to marry? School? Parties? How well do a boy and girl know each other before marriage? Some parents say there is a strict system of no dating and others say there is some dating. But what does dating mean here?

• • • •

"Out of control" [a phrase used when parents ask to have a youth sent to Youth Hall] seems to mean that the youth won't obey the parents or may have run away from home. Staff at Youth Hall say the youth are mostly misdirected.

• • • •

The best way to approach youth seems to be informal; formal meetings and groups don't seem to work.

Money. One observation regarding the meaning of money brings underlying values of the new culture into historical perspective:

S.'s ranch and their way of living is similar to the subsistence economy of Hawaii in earlier days—live day to day and food is plentiful. Farming was important before World War II, but now people are beginning to work for wages, and more and more women are working outside the home.

• • • •

There is always much food—perhaps the tradition of abundance is more important than expense or waste.

Other observations add to the perspective:

One woman said Guamanians don't worry much about money; friends are important.

• • • •

Fiestas and celebrations are important enough so that people may borrow money for them. Part of the pay check may often be put aside for this purpose.

Houses. The students were struck by the contrast between their own values and the Guamanian culture with regard to houses.

One can't judge economic status from the outside of a house. Money is not spent on fancy houses and furniture. What is important?

• • • •

At times I am shocked. Houses are so different from my idea of homes.

• • • •

Houses are usually small and unpretentious; the inside is clean and knick-knacks are used to make it attractive. Often there is no glass in the

windows. The outside around the house is often messy. Many homes have no indoor plumbing.

One student discovered that:

People do not like to live in the modern urban renewal houses. They are too close together, call for a different style of living; families are not allowed to keep pets, chickens, etc. Shouldn't the urban renewal people take into account the ways of living of the people for whom the houses are built?

Supernatural Beliefs. These beliefs had come into conversations from the beginning.

Althought some Guamanians profess not to believe, others say "Taotaomonas[10] [spirits of ancient Chamorros] live in the woods, and many of us are careful." A number of people have made reference to taotaomonas, and despite some denials, the belief comes through from time to time.

• • • •

I was told that parents of the older generation do not swear at their children—they hold the belief that the curse might come true.

• • • •

Belief in taotaomonas fits well into the culture except with Catholicism.

• • • •

I cannot completely negate the spirits.

Language and Concepts. Apparently the students had forgotten that they had been told how various languages classify objects and events differently and that some languages do not make the gender distinctive in the third person singular pronoun.

Why do Guamanians use the pronouns "he" and "she" without reference to the sex of the person? Some people in Hawaii do this, too.

• • • •

The concept of privacy is probably different than in the U.S. My roommate waited to move in until I came because it would be lonely in the room alone—and I am more concerned with privacy and a place to be alone.

• • • •

What does the term "lazy" mean—or does it have more than one meaning? An aide spoke of someone as lazy but this man had cleared several acres of land and was growing plants and producing chickens. He just wanted to stay on the land. Is this an example of transition in culture and is one lazy who doesn't want to get involved in the cash economy? But a woman who has six children says she is "lazy" to have more.

• • • •

What does shame mean? A friend said, "I would feel shame to dance out there until others are dancing."

• • • •

Betel nut has social value—like passing cigarettes in the United States.

---

[10]The taotaomonas are believed to be Chamorros who have been killed and who haunted their old land districts, not as gods or ghosts, but as men of superhuman strength. They are believed to impose certain tabus. If a person found himself astray in a district not his own, he might be harmed by these spirits unless he asked permission to enter the district. Once on the land he dared not sing, urinate, fish, pick fruits, or hunt without permission. Belief in the taotaomonas is said to have sustained the social system of Guam in ancient days. See Thompson, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-141.

The Field Seminar

The early sessions of the field seminars affirmed the disorganization reflected in the students' journals in this first stage of learning. The students in both Groups X and Y had some concern about whether the journals were "satisfactory"—thereby revealing the customary pattern of learning in relation to what is expected. Telling them that there was no preconceived notion of what would be "satisfactory" did not help, nor did a brief review of the discussion in the pre-training seminar about the journals. This intellectual, rational reply did not respond to their need for approval in relation to the journals, which was really the only area in which they could get customary assurance.

The two groups differed in this beginning stage; one was more culturally oriented than the other. Some members of Group Y used the first session mainly to discuss frustrations, e.g., lack of opportunity to operate independently. There was recognizable discomfort among members of the group and with the instructor. Questions were raised about the amount of time being used to get acquainted everywhere. It seemed too long, some said, but one student quoted a Guamanian who had said that "the best way to get acquainted is to try to be introduced formally and there will be some kind of gathering when you can be welcomed officially, so to speak, or the commissioner will officially welcome you to the village. Then, when you go into the village, it is simple." It was suggested that if this point was valid that it was the approach for which to aim.

One member of the group suggested that we discuss the best ways for the group to use all the journals, the best ways for the seminar to be used, and whether sharing a cultural comment might give some insights. The group agreed that each student would read his own and every other student's journal prior to each session. Some decided to exchange ideas as they were reading and come to the seminar with what had emerged from these exchanges. In this way, all would benefit from an expanded perspective, and the presentation of alternative ideas would move them to more substantive exploration.

The next session of this group was a mixture of expressions of discomfort and frustration and expressions revealing shifts in reactions. Some students said: "We are not moving fast enough," or "I'm feeling very shy about talking with people." Sharing of feelings and discussion about talking with people was helpful for all.

Changes in their reactions were also revealed: "For the first time I really got involved and I had risked quite a bit"; "I like it but I don't feel as much freedom as I do at home"; "For the first time in a week I thought about the showers being cold, and I don't feel I have to get the ants off the wall, so I am making progress." The students challenged the instructor's view that they should arrive by "clock time" for appointments made with Guamanians even though they knew people would not be ready until later. They did not accept the explanation that Guamanians would expect them to observe their own cultural pattern at the same time as Guamanians would observe their own. Sev-

eral of the students reacted so strongly to time situations that the instructor asked: "How can we move beyond just being angry and fighting this? We need to express our feelings but can we move beyond and try to learn what time means to Guamanians as different from what it means in the United States?"

In the early sessions group X expressed ideas and frustrations less specifically and more indirectly in terms of cultural observations, but their involvement was implicit in what they said:

> I am getting a new idea of friendship here. At first I couldn't understand why you [the instructor] kept saying we are here to learn the culture through becoming friends with the people. This struck me negatively, like the U.S. Government going-to-make-peace-with-the-Indians kind of thing. The more I listened to the people, the more the word "friend" kept cropping up. "We're friends. I have three pieces and give you one, we're friends."
>
> • • • •
>
> I realize that language is a big cue to culture. One may ask a question but rarely does one get a direct definite answer. The reply is often, "Maybe so." And there are different ways of approaching a question or situation; perhaps indirect communication rather than direct communication is customary here.
>
> • • • •
>
> Does the Chamorro language have a word for privacy? Maybe it isn't a concept here and doesn't need a word.

In the second session some members of the group, speaking from their own cultural frame of reference said: "So much time and energy are wasted; there is such lack of efficiency." One student expressed concern because the aides and workers with whom they were riding (to get oriented) often spoke Chamorro to the families they visited: "Why do they do this? Are they talking about us?" To this, another student replied: "You are uptight and take it personally instead of wondering what they are saying to each other and trying to learn some words of the language."

Questions were raised about the meaning of various expressions: "What does it mean when people greet you with 'I thought you weren't coming,' though you have arrived at the appointed time?"

By the end of the second session in both groups it was clear that students felt a need to talk more openly, with no holds barred, about feelings, frustrations, discontent, plans and schedules, and so on. Group Y asked for such a session as a special meeting. Group X was less articulate but responded eagerly when the instructor suggested such a discussion.

The groping of students toward a new style of learning—finding new approaches—in an ambiguous situation in which they could not use their old style was clearly evident in the ephemeral quality of the seminar sessions of both groups.

The Second Stage: Re-examination and Reflection

During the second stage (the third week), a gentle shift in the learning process seemed to occur for most students. Re-examination, reflection, "taking

stock"—these are the terms that characterized the journals and the field seminar at this point.

Most students spoke about the need to stay at home for a day or to be alone. Most engaged in more reflection and less doing than during the previous weeks. Some had colds, upset stomachs, or other physical problems. Compared with the earlier period, when most of the journals reflected considerable frustration, now only three of the twelve students did so and generally with less intensity. Observations and comments about the culture tended to be neutral, sprinkled with some positive and some negative comparisons with their own culture. Analysis of the journals revealed a sense of readiness to explore what was not understood. Some awareness of their own cultural biases was evident.

It should be noted that at this third-week stage most of the students had found some one person as a social friend or a person or family whom they enjoyed, with whom they felt at ease and wanted to talk. There were exceptions, however, and for those students frustration remained high. In a burst of feeling one student commented:

> So far this is a sacrifice of self for another culture. At any one time this is not so bad but cumulatively it is frustration. Freedom of choice is restricted, and I am told with whom I can dance. [This was the instructor's restriction that they dance only with people to whom they had been introduced.] I have to think about not offending people and I don't know the cues.

Another student affirmed these sentiments and added, "We are nobody. We do not show anything of ourselves. People we are with speak Chamorro. Why do they exclude us this way? I feel like an intruder." Some of the students did not agree and said they saw this as a "process we go through at the beginning of getting to know people and it is a . . . stage of learning." One remarked that "it is good to discuss our frustrations but it doesn't seem to solve them. It seems to show how ingrained are the ways of our own culture." The discussions tended, then, to swing between cognitive and affective reactions.

One student had a further frustrating experience during this week. The student wanted to participate in a family's preparations for a christening and hoped, after the christening, to continue seeing the family. During the preparations the student made several cultural errors. Later, when the student asked to visit again, the mother ignored the request. The Guamanians use this as one way of saying no; in this instance the student missed the cue. This increased the student's frustration at the inability to communicate "because people are not direct in their responses." The frustration was too great at the moment for the student to perceive a possible difference between the two cultures in ways of communication.

Given some variation, most students showed some shift in learning this week in the direction of increased awareness of their own cultural values operating in their judgments, comments, and behavior and in trying to understand Guamanian culture. The fact of having handled the initial period of cul-

ture shock—of ambiguity, uncertainty, and temporary loss of identity—and having learned that they could risk enough to develop relationships with people of another culture may have been significant factors in the shift of attitude noted in the journals.

Journals

Although personal discomforts continued, they tended to be manifested in the context of interaction with people, and students showed some capacity to see themselves in the interchange:

> There surely is a lot I don't understand about this culture. Made another mistake because of miscommunication. When we returned to the office, lunch was not there as before, and, intending to be thoughtful, I suggested we might go to Y.'s to eat. E. seemed angry and said if I preferred the food there, to go, but there is plenty of food here. We found our lunch in the refrigerator and although I recognized my error I couldn't seem to explain why I had made the suggestion.
>
> • • • •
>
> Changed my approach today—not asking many questions, just looked cheerful and interested. It really worked. People seemed less threatened and came forward to talk and some initiated conversation.
>
> • • • •
>
> I don't know how to make small talk with Guamanians. I ask about their lives and they don't ask about me. Maybe I shouldn't ask—how do they feel about it? Maybe I should just keep quiet and see what Guamanians talk about.
>
> • • • •
>
> My own culture and what is important to me stands out so much more clearly in the background of another culture.

Reactions to the new culture reflected not only a desire to understand but also an ability to make finer discriminations. Several students noted that "boys at the Dairy Queen are oblivious to the long waiting line and take care of each customer as though he is the only one"; another observed that "people don't seem to mind waiting." Still another wrote:

> Funny, Americans have to be on time even to have fun. To me time is precious. I don't like wasting it, especially if it is my fun time. This sounds strange now that I think about it.

Others observed:

> Guamanians do not seem to schedule their time precisely.
>
> • • • •
>
> Maybe there are differences according to the situation. Perhaps among friends time is not so important. One of the girls said there is no word in Chamorro for "late"; no expression for "What time is it?"

Other comments illustrate how students were attempting to learn the meaning of some of the differences in the new culture:

> I asked L. whether she ever had time to be alone. She said not much, but sometimes just the family will be at home and will sit around and eat and talk together. Did L. understand what I meant? Or does she consider being with the family being alone? Is being alone valued or needed?
>
> • • • •

People seem to establish their identity by referring to other relatives. Once identity is established, conversation begins in a relaxed way. Family appears to have considerable significance. And R. says the Guamanian philosophy and way of life is based on sharing. We need to know more.

• • • •

Planning does not seem to work very well. Planned a hike, but it did not get organized and we couldn't go. I went to S. for a Youth Club meeting. Again, planning problems and the organizing meeting did not materialize. Is this related in any way to the Guamanian concept of time?

• • • •

Do laws regarding juvenile delinquency reflect what Guamanians think is delinquency or are they stateside laws? Are federal programs relevant to Guamanian life or are they primarily relevant to stateside culture?

We had been asking ourselves from time to time how we seem to the Guamanians. One indication was a question from one of the university students at the dormitory. She didn't understand why young men and women were permitted to travel together if they were not married. She had assumed the students were all married to one another.

The Field Seminar

The discussion of Group Y was less scattered for this week than previously. The group immediately began an exploration of their cultural observations and questions; the emphasis was on cognitive learning. There was some evidence of divergent thinking as they explored several possible interpretations of a cultural phenomenon which they did not yet understand and for which they still had no basis for identifying a pattern.

Significance of the Family. Several members of the group had become increasingly interested in the extended family, and one member opened the subject:

A.'s journal notes that one parent said it is the duty or responsibility of a parent to provide a house for married children. Our journals have previously suggested that parents want their married children to live at home. We haven't considered the possibility that to provide housing may be regarded as a duty or responsibility. How does this tie in with what we have said so far, that as long as children are under the parental roof (even to 50 years of age) they are not totally independent?

Others added:

There is something far different in family here than where I come from in the United States. A sense of continuity? A closely knit group, almost a community? If true, it might give a clue. Perhaps it gives prestige and respect to be able to say, "I can provide for others," or say, "I am responsible for the welfare of the family." This kind of interdependence, as different from in the United States, suggests a different way of thinking about yourself, about roles, about relationships. We need to learn more about the kinship situation. People appear to get their identity through family relationships. Parents have obligations to children, children have obligations to parents, and godparents have obligations. Everyone is obligated by blood and, in addition, because people do things for you. Perhaps we could learn more about these ideas if we could have some

time with families by staying briefly with them. We should take any opportunity to do this if invited for overnight, or a weekend.

Education. One student raised questions about the meaning of education to Guamanians:

> All parents seem to value education for their children, but do we know what it means? Is it because they will have certain kinds of job opportunities, e.g., a "clean" job? Is it social status? Is it economic status? In the north part of the island, if you work on a ranch you are considered to be doing nothing—farming has low status there. There seems to be some indication that having an education means you are better in relationships. We don't know much about meanings. Could we work on this and come back to it later?

Politeness. Earlier some students commented on what seemed to them a lack of what Americans would call politeness. A member of the group said:

> We have noticed that clerks in shops, and others as well, seem different from in the United States. I tried something one day. I asked how do you say, "It's a pleasure," and "You're welcome." The person was confused and so I thought I had made a mistake and was imposing my culture. Then I remembered that in the pre-training seminar we talked about not knowing the cues. So, in the restaurant, I tried with the waitress. She mumbled something. So I said, "If I say thank you to you, what do you do?" She told me that what she says means "I'm more grateful." Lesson: When people mumble in Chamorro, it may mean something like that. We have been thinking that people don't say anything—but they do.

Another student said:

> Let's discuss what we think it means when people say, "I thought you weren't coming," and "I almost forgot you were coming." It is almost an automatic greeting when we arrive even though we may come early or late or at the appointed time. And people apologize "for the mess" even though the house is neat and clean. Apologies are so much a part of the culture; why? Do people feel an inferior status? Do they regard statesiders as having superior status? Do we apologize less to someone we feel has less status and more to someone we feel has superior status? You don't necessarily respect everyone because he has superior status, do you?

A student replied:

> In some cultures, anyone in superior status deserves respect no matter who he is. In Chinese culture, apology is used often to show respect. For example, you eat in my home, I may say, "Sorry, I had to mess your mouth," or one might say, "Excuse this coarse food" (the food may be a delicious five-to-seven-course dinner). This is respect. We shouldn't forget what we discussed in pre-training—that most Pacific and Asian people have an attitude of inferior status in relation to Americans in a number of areas of culture.

Time. The concept of Guamanian time was still a puzzle and now someone put the question this way:

> The U.S. economic system depends on time and efficiency and this is what we think is "right" and "best" and it is appropriate in our system. We can't stand wasting time. In Guam, a person really waits on each cus-

tomer, each gets full attention no matter how long the line, and the employee is not upset by this. Does the system and way of life here call for efficiency? If not, what does it call for as having high priority in value? Can we try to work on this?

Group X, in this third-week seminar session, focused on the continuing frustration of some students. Not all felt this, however, and one student said, "This is part of a different approach to learning that hopefully will open us up." Some students were less satisfied than others with their learning opportunities, and frustrations needed to be discussed before other matters could be pursued.

Third Stage: Reorganization

We have called this period (fourth and fifth weeks) one of reorganization because, in general, the students appeared to be looking both inward at themselves and outward. A sense of stimulation, emanating from both their successes and failures, permeated the journals. An intensification of feelings and ideas with respect to their own changes and to their attempts to understand the culture was also evident in the journals and seminar sessions. They showed some perspective on their own feelings and frustrations and cultural frame of reference, and they appreciated the different characteristics of their relationships with Guamanians. They were involved in Guamanian life. They had now gained sufficient confidence in themselves to take more risks.

Journals

One student whose attitude outwardly seemed to remain essentially negative during the period actually found the learning to be positive. Several students experienced swings of mood.

> I'm not as happy here as at home. My normal sources of rewards are missing—people I know. Here the flow of communication is more difficult. Here I relate to all people, not those I select, as at home.

A week later this same student wrote:

> The longer I am here the easier it gets. There are rewards in this culture but it takes time to learn how to get them.

Another student wrote:

> I surely feel alone in these situations when I meet a new family. I find it difficult to make conversation. Can I do it? I'm tired of not knowing the rules, not being able to read the cues.

A day or so later, the student wrote:

> The only way to have meaningful relationships is to try, to risk, and, if I am rejected, well, just to go on. I wonder how I come across to Guamanian people? I'm very aware these last several days of the closeness of the people in this village.

And yet a few days later this student wrote:

> Despite the fact that G. didn't give me a warm greeting, I had an enjoyable time. Maybe I'm learning the rules. Yes, things are changing. I feel at home now.

It may be that the students did not anticipate certain qualities that they found in their relationships with Guamanians. In any case, certain qualities

were sufficiently significant to them to be included in their journals:

> F's grandfather is so warm—the most warmth I've ever received from someone I didn't know previously. Is this the warmth Guamanians mean when they talk about "before"? If so, they are being gypped in the modernization process.
>
> • • • •
>
> The old man asked me to bring him a beer and he touched my face in thanking me. Chinese do that, too.
>
> • • • •
>
> What does friendship mean here? What does acquaintance mean?
>
> • • • •
>
> I wonder what the Guamanians are getting from us? And what are they thinking about us now?

Students were now having more subtle insights about the changes in themselves and were seeing them in the context of their own culture:

> I am aware that I feel more shy here, not so spontaneous as at home, and I don't talk as much for fear of saying something that might be offensive.
>
> • • • •
>
> Had a continental dinner and I am aware that I am missing some things more than the missed things have to offer. Reminded me of my mechanized life back home. I am more respectful of Guamanian ways of life as I recall how so many people take time to talk with us, never seem in a hurry, and appear relaxed. I think I have been missing things that do not deserve so much missing.
>
> • • • •
>
> What is happening in me is exciting even though there are still times when I do not know how to behave.
>
> • • • •
>
> Now I see and enjoy the beauty, the people, and their way of living. I am still afraid of imposing on people so I hold back, afraid I will be a nuisance. People in the United States tend to be so busy doing things they don't want to be bothered and I can't quite get away from this feeling. I'm going to do less talking and more listening. There was a long line at the post office and I was mailing a package for my friend who collects stamps. The clerk took time to find 20 different stamps for me and the line of people didn't bother her. It made me uncomfortable though.
>
> • • • •
>
> Today I realized the relevance of culture in behavior. If one understands behavior in this sense, perhaps a different educational approach is needed in school. Maybe it takes a certain degree of severance from homeland to become truly bicultural.

Cultural observations in the journals now reflected an acceptance of differences and a clear search for an understanding of the new culture. For example, one student pulled together what had been said in the journals about fiestas and then talked with a number of Guamanians about their purpose, thinking to find a clue to something the group had not understood—the pattern of invitations.

Another student examined the various activities of Guamanians in relation to time:

> Appointments do not appear to have high priority; people are not annoyed at having to wait; instead, they enjoy each other while they wait. The clerk takes an interest in serving your needs regardless of the people who are waiting; time of arrival and departure for social gatherings seems of little significance. If it does have significance, the point is made in advance that the event will be according to "clock time." There are few clocks. Time is not scheduled for doing one thing in a given period. . . . These differences from our own efficiency orientation would certainly have significance for social workers in working with people of a culture or subculture which used the Guamanian concept. Can we adapt our values, goals, and techniques and find new approaches? I am beginning to understand the culture now.

By this point several students showed acceptance of the fact that differences in verbal and non-verbal (or hidden) communication were no longer matters for annoyance or frustration but were crucial if they were to communicate with people of different cultures or ethnic or subcultural groups. This change from cognitive, passive understanding to affective, active acceptance was characteristic of this period.

Analysis of the journals during this period suggested that most of the students were moving through the twilight zone from feeling like outsiders to feeling like insiders, i.e., they were moving toward new perspectives, a new perception of Guamanian culture, and were feeling accepted by Guamanians.

The Field Seminar

In general, the field seminar sessions of both groups reflected acceptance of and a sense of stimulation from the differences. Most students now were very much involved in their relationships with Guamanians. Some of their comments relating to changes in themselves have an evaluative quality; the discussions on cultural observations show an increasing ability to see connections among formerly discrete concepts. One student who had been struggling to identify with the Guamanian concept of sharing spoke of frustration because:

> I was trying to share in the Guamanian way and didn't know what to do. I'm beginning to see the Guamanian way a little more clearly. I am caught in my individualistic ways and I don't know how to move. I am nervous about asking if I can help. In the United States people might be offended if I just pitch in. I think, here, I should just pitch in.

Later in the week the student wrote:

> Last week I thought I needed more interactions with people individually, but yesterday I saw it all in a different way. I am beginning to see how the rules work and I have some feeling of being accepted by the group. I feel much more a part of the people, even the children.

The shift toward being insiders came up again when someone asked: "How do you think people in Guam regard you?" A student replied: "I can't be sure at this point. I'm not sure I am yet at the inside level in interacting but I have reached the level of genuine feeling in interactions."

Another student, apparently feeling the urge to push toward practice in divergent thinking, said:

> I am dissatisfied with myself this week because I seem to be getting a

little of this and that and not thinking about it. We have a jigsaw puzzle and aren't doing anything to put it together. Are our perceptions dulled or numb? Are we too accepting of what we see and now just try to fit it into what we have been thinking? Maybe we should not be so accepting and instead say maybe it doesn't fit, but why doesn't it? Maybe we are concluding too easily.

Several different ways of approaching cultural ideas emerged in the seminar sessions in this period. Recognizing differences between Guamanians and their own concepts of husband-wife relationships, the students examined what they understood about the Guamanian concept:

> What do we know about husband-wife relationships? How well does the couple know each other? What is the primary value in the relationship? The roles appear to be fairly clearly defined, and that may simplify things. The couple normally has known each other most of their lives, they usually come from the same village. In the United States emphasis is placed on companionship in marriage, but is this a priority value here? Is it a significant concept? Or is it as in *Fiddler on the Roof*, when he asked his wife, "Do you love me?" and she responds, "What do you mean, do I love you?" Perhaps Guamanians assume that love exists and it is not necessary to talk about it.

A good deal of scattered, but recurring, discussion had occurred over the weeks about parent-youth relationships. Now students, noting that the chaperone system with respect to dating had been traditional practice, asked what beliefs had led to the use of this system. Did it involve a belief they thought was held in some cultures that a man and woman alone together would inevitably have sex (actually, the belief is more complicated than this), and, if so, is this a factor in an implicit attitude that dating is associated with having sex? The students thought there was some evidence of this attitude among parents who hold to traditional practices and either forbid dating or permit it only with a chaperone. The attitude, furthermore, appears to have been transmitted to the youth so some, in turn, act accordingly. Some parents have moved away from the traditional beliefs and practices and permit dating under certain circumstances. Many parents know that a girl will tell them she is going somewhere and instead will meet a boy. The youth know the parents know what they are doing, but they find "ways to do some things they want to do without making waves at home." For some parents this may mean the youth are "out of control." Others see it as evidence of a transition that is taking place but may approach it either through punishment or by ignoring it. The point the students made is that discussion between parents and youth as a means of understanding their differences and arriving at some workable plan of action does not appear to be commonly used—as it might be in the American culture.

During this stage, the students put the recurring theme of inefficiency and wasted time into the context of work and play. One student asked:

> Why do we use the words inefficiency and wasted time? What is work? Something specified in a contract? We talk of inefficiency in regard to measuring a goal, but maybe Guamanians are not progressing toward a goal in the same way as statesiders. What are some of the goals of

> Guamanians? What does a job mean? The girl at the post office and the man at the ice cream shop had similar attitudes. As statesiders, we would call it inefficiency in not serving people faster, but Guamanians may not have that goal. They may feel that serving each customer's needs as well as possible would be efficiency par excellence—involving yourself in meeting someone's need. In the United States we tend to consider work as doing something we don't like (not true for all, of course) but Guamanians speak of building a house together as "This isn't work, it is fun." In the building of the summer huts the purpose was not to hurry and get them built within a certain time, but to socialize in the work, to enjoy the process of building them. Could it be that the family kinship relationship is at work here—the person is blended into his role? He is not just a worker, he is also a person. The summer trainees don't see themselves as workers, but as people; they work and they play. Here, it seems man and work need not be two separate entities. Is this a possibility? Within such a context, doing things within certain specified times is less important. Plans can be changed easily and people function comfortably. Work may not be separated from living.

Continuing in this vein, the students realized they were wrestling with an intellectual idea regarding personality and role, with alienation of man from his work and of man moving from personalization to depersonalization, with flexibility, and with fundamentally different concepts of time and goals.

One other approach used by the students to bring out an awareness of differences in values should be noted. They began challenging each other, using their own differing cultural perceptions and values to make their points. In recalling an earlier discussion about frustration, one student spoke of a roommate's feeling of loneliness. The roommate (from one of the Pacific cultures) emphasized individualism and independence, and therefore did not want to say he needed a friend, yet he did need friendship. Noting that the importance attached to independence is a United States value, one of the students (Chinese) said:

> For us something would be wrong about this. Actually, you [from the United States] seem to me to seek companionship, friendships, lots of parties, and so on. In being so independent, you actually become dependent with many of you searching all the time for someone to care for you. I wonder whether there is insecurity in this independence. I don't think Guamanians have this.

One student told of a situation where a teacher was holding a class at a Center and someone came in and started the juke box. The student saw this as a disturbance and was upset but concluded the teacher did not see it as such as she simply moved her class outside. Another student disagreed:

> I think the teacher did see it as a disturbance; she frowned momentarily and then took the children outside. We might conjecture that she turned a negative into a positive experience and thought why not have the children dance to the music.

The discussion shifted to the possible differences in the way Guamanians and statesiders might solve the situation. One student felt this was rude and insulting and would have spoken to the person or stopped the juke box by pulling out the plug. Another thought a Guamanian would not handle it by direct con-

frontation but would tend to look for an indirect solution and perhaps not take this kind of incident so personally since it happened in a public place.

These illustrations show some of the different ways by which students were trying to feel their way into Guamanian culture—trying to understand how Guamanians think, feel, and act, and the context in which they do so.

The Fourth Stage: Emergence of New Perspectives

This final period (sixth through eighth week) had an evaluative quality on the one hand and a putting together of pieces on the other. The learning process followed certain trends in both groups for all students except one. Given some variation in the intensity of the experience, the major changes in the students were that: (1) the frustrations mentioned were those accompanying a desire to increase learning; (2) the students were, for the most part, acutely aware of changes in their attitudes and outlooks; (3) most students experienced marked satisfaction in the quality of warmth and sharing in their new Guamanian friendships; (4) more than half felt they had become an integral part of the village; (5) most had sufficient understanding of the culture to recognize how little they knew but also realized how much they had learned—they thought they would be able to generalize from this knowledge and experience to other cultures and subcultures; (6) all had developed considerable awareness of their own cultures, and most engaged in re-examining and evaluating aspects that had previously been taken for granted and considered perhaps as universal; and (7) many could articulate some of their new perspectives.

Students were reflecting, participating, and thinking positively in a Guamanian frame of reference, within the limitations of their learning. This positive thinking, however, did not necessarily mean enjoyment of all aspects of the culture, nor did their forthright evaluation of their own cultural values by contrasting them with Guamanian values mean that they were denigrating their own culture. Not all were satisfied with the stage of their learning, but they had some confidence in what they could do and were more ready to take greater risks in interacting with people. The students now recognized the significance of the learning process in which they were involved and the new style of learning they were beginning to use, and they knew that an active understanding of a culture is essential to cross-cultural or subcultural communication. They expressed some concern that they still did not comprehend the basic structures of Guamanian communication, but they recognized its significance in cross-cultural interaction.

In both journals and seminar sessions students tended to review their experience and saw changes in themselves by contrasting how they felt at the beginning of the project with how they saw themselves at the end. A few had set rather high expectations in terms of willingness to take emotional risks and worked especially hard during this period to attain their expectations.

Journals

One student wrote: "I'm still not taking enough chances, enough risks. When I tried today, it worked!" Some felt alien to their early thoughts and feelings: "For people who had so many negative frustrations at the beginning we have certainly come a long way." One student, among several who seemed to sense a possible re-entry shock, said: "Hawaii seems foreign. Even my parents seem like strangers. Makes me wonder what adjustments are to be made when we get home." A student who had experienced considerable early frustration said: "I am more comfortable with not knowing, not having answers, more willing to explore ideas and still not have answers."

Some students spoke of their perspectives in relation to the purpose of the project. For instance, some students spoke of being convinced that this experience could be generalized to more than one culture; another was at last convinced about the value of culture-general rather than culture-specific learning; still another asked: "Is biculturality different from adjusting? I think it is. I think it is developing in yourself a new way of looking at things, at people, at the world."

During this period students began to identify new perspectives with regard to their own cultural values:

> I am beginning to look at my culture in perspective. Learning what other people do is making me look at what I do in comparison. That is a value in this culture learning. I am questioning values and things I have previously taken for granted. Is all our American individualism a good thing? It leads to a lot of lonely, left-out people. In the United States, initial acceptance is faster than in Guam but often there is no real feeling of closeness and trust as here. Generosity and thoughtfulness have, I think, higher value and are more prevalent here than in the U.S. People are less ego-centered. I could learn from them.

A number of students spoke generally or specifically about having a new concept of social work and, after attending a stateside program at a mental health center, questioned whether our social work methods would be useful there:

> The lesson for me: Leave your behavior and methods at home. One has to understand the cultural setting before one can do any kind of effective therapy; be extremely tentative at first. Is counseling itself cultural? Is getting into feelings and working them out a universal good? Or is something else more appropriate here? What would the goals be? My thought: Personality is formed in a culture and can only be worked with within a cultural frame of reference.

In sum, the students' journals generally reflected a widening of perspectives and views about themselves, their own and the other culture, and a sense of confidence in their capacities to find their way through most situations. This is exactly what they have done.

The impact of the Guamanians on the students is clear. By virtue of the students' presence in Guam, they also had an impact on Guamanians. One example follows. Guamanian women are ordinarily reluctant to speak out in mixed gatherings. As one person said, "For a Guamanian woman, meeting a

stranger is not an everyday occurrence." It calls for some changes in the normal way of doing things. However, the evening of the Parish Council party, their last "sharing with us," anyone who felt like saying something was invited to do so. A young woman who was close to some of the students and whom we all loved apologized a bit but then simply and beautifully told the group she had learned more about her own culture in the weeks of association with the students than she had known in her entire life. The spirit and the feeling she conveyed to all and the fact that she had dared to take the risk—to speak this way—to share her experience with others was both touching and exciting.

It may be that the students did for some Guamanians just what the Guamanians did for us—helped them to become aware of their own cultural system. This may, indeed, be one thing we can do for each other in cross-cultural learning.

The Field Seminar

Some of the probing which appeared in the journals was carried into the seminar sessions. Two illustrations will give some notion of the degree to which students could feel and think as Guamanians:

> What is meant when we write, "He is Westernized," or "This is Americanized," or "This was a Westernized party"? Do we mean that someone has been to the United States? What values are we using? What are the manifestations?

A student from an Asian background said:

> To me, Guam is not really a part of the United States in spirit. It is a Pacific area, it is closer to a Micronesian and Polynesian way of life than to an American way. When I say Westernized I mean not only the United States but Europe—that kind of influence as different from Asia. To talk about Westernized means to talk about every aspect of life and that is difficult. I think what happens to us is that we see things which look like what we have been used to and, therefore, identify them as Westernized or Americanized.

To this, another student added, "And if we are talking with people and they talk and think as we do, they are Westernized." The first student responded, "I think, in effect, we have a superior attitude, so when anything 'good' comes out of examining something, we say it is 'American.' " The second student said, "I would like to think otherwise, but I am sure you are right." Another student added, "A Guamanian home may seem Westernized in terms of some of the material things, but the values are Guamanian." The first student said:

> Maybe it is because I haven't lived stateside, but I seldom have the reaction that something is Americanized, but when *you* see it, *you* feel it is. Maybe it is just as much Guamanian to have some of these things but we check off items we think are "luxury" and then say it is Westernized.

The students decided to imagine they were a Guamanian family and were going to build a house. The imaginary family could afford a comfortable house. The questions which followed the imaginary building reflect the nature

of their understanding:

> What are the functions of a guest room? Why have the bathroom outside? We decorated the rooms and walls but what do we know about the Guamanian concept of beauty? We do not have stationary walls to separate the rooms, do we know why? We have a big kitchen with a big table so the whole family can eat together. But do Guamanian families all eat together? Or is the concept of eating together more American? What is the Guamanian sense of property/possessions? This has a lot to do with the kind of house we have. Do Guamanian children have their own books, toys, etc.,—"mine," "yours"? Can we substantiate the idea that sharing means also that what is mine and what is yours is not so clearcut and this affects the way the home is used? Perhaps walls are artificial. Some houses are constructed so they give a feeling of natural blending between inside and outside. Does this go even farther? Do I feel that my piece of property is strictly just mine? There appear to be no fences here, why? Is it that people like the idea of natural extension and easy access to each other—sharing?

It was at the end of a session that one student made the following perceptive comment:

> When you are in a culture you learn some of the inconsistencies in patterns, the reality that doesn't come through in a book.

Summary

This chapter is a detailed account of the stages the two Guam groups went through in the experiential cross-cultural learning process. We have shared many illustrations in order that the reader may understand more completely how the students learned another culture.

Lysgaard, in his study, observed that adjustment in another culture as a process over time seemed to "follow a U-shaped curve: adjustment is felt to be easy and successful to begin with; then follows a 'crisis' in which one feels less well adjusted, somewhat lonely and unhappy; finally, one begins to feel better adjusted again, becoming more integrated into the foreign community."[11]

The students in Guam did not follow this U-curve exactly, but then there were differences between Lysgaard's study and this project. First, our students had had some preparation for how they could expect to feel at the beginning in the new culture; they had a faculty member with them; and they knew from previous experience that developing relationships is never easy. Second, Lysgaard studied a group who were in another culture for a period of less than three months to more than three years, the average stay being about a year. The students of this project were in Guam only eight weeks. Their outlook at the beginning of their stay was comparable to that which occurred at the bottom of the U-shaped curve. Possibly our students experienced the initial sense of excitement about a new learning adventure during the pre-training seminar before they left home.

---

[11]Sverre Lysgaard, "Adjustment in a Foreign Society: Norwegian Fulbright Grantees Visiting the United States," *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 45-51.

Lippitt and Watson[12] list five problems of cross-cultural learning and teaching, "the solution of which seems to be crucial in determining whether positive interaction would develop between the visitors and the hosts, and in determining whether useful learning would come about." They are as follows:

1. Achieving personal security and self-esteem in relation to the host culture and its representatives.
2. Ambivalence about responsibility, authority, and autonomy in the educational program (governmental authority).
3. Transforming differences between the home culture and the host culture into learning experiences rather than alienation and withdrawal experiences.
4. Maintaining . . . relationships with the home country.
5. Maintaining and using new learnings in the home country after return.

Numbers 2 and 4 of the above are not applicable to the field learning of this project, Numbers 1 and 3 are affirmed by it, and Number 5 bears on the overall purpose for which this project was developed. This is discussed in the next chapter.

The Gullahorns, reporting studies in adjustment in cross-cultural experience, underscore two critical factors:

> . . . the importance of some structure in the relationships between the "stranger" and those in his immediate environment, and the necessity for some realistic goals that are attainable through participation in the social system. Individuals with commitments sufficiently compelling to force their involvement and their coming to terms with the exigencies of the situations they encounter are less likely to withdraw into self-defeating estrangement than are those who are less well anchored in on-going pursuits.[13]

This project purposely did not build in the first factor—structured relationships—because one objective was to develop the capacity for divergent thinking/creativity. Perhaps commitment is the overriding factor here. The students are committed to educational preparation for a profession and a range of learning experiences. Might commitment be a factor in the learning as a "process over time," and might it tend to accelerate the learning process?

The four stages of the learning process described actually represent the process of learning to ignore the system of criterial attributes which guided behavior in the first culture and to make discriminations along a new set of attributes organized in such a way as to develop new behavior.

The students regarded the experiential learning—affective and cognitive—as a total experience in itself, but the three learning components of the project produced an overall learning which is reported in the next chapter.

---

[12]Ronald Lippitt and Jeanne Watson, "Some Special Problems of Learning and Teaching Process in Cross-Cultural Education," *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 11, pp. 59-65.

[13]Jeanne E. and John T. Gullahorn, "American Students Abroad: Professional vs Personal Development," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, No. 368 (November, 1966), p. 59.

Chapter V

OVERALL LEARNING

In the preceding chapter we concentrated on giving the reader the details of the cross-cultural learning process in this project. In this chapter we will put the learning into its broader perspective.

The project reflects the view that *what* we learn, as well as *how* we learn, is culturally determined. Since most of culture is learned on a non-conscious basis, what people in any culture can talk about regarding their culture leaves out much in the cultural system that makes life and behavior meaningful and that differentiates one group from another. The project sought to have students develop an active understanding of culture by providing an experience that forced them to learn what cannot be talked about because it is non-conscious and, at the same time, required a style of learning different from that demanded by their previous education. Our data with respect to learning are impressionistic because, in our view, the goals of the project could not be attained through use of questionnaire methods and an imposed research design. This view was also expressed by Guthrie, speaking of Peace Corps Volunteers:

> . . . those who were most articulate about the deep personal significance of the encounter observed that learning to cope with the mysteries of another society are inevitably stressful. They contended that those who had said they enjoyed every moment of it had never really come to grips with the meaning of meeting another people on their terms. This is not the kind of material that lends itself to questionnaires, nor is it shared with strangers. It is, rather, a deeply personal adventure filled with adversities and triumphs. The costs involve some painful insights into oneself, and the rewards include a new capacity for human relationships. It means something different for each person, but for all it involves fulfillment of oneself and a new appreciation of others.[1]

---

[1]George M. Guthrie, "A Behavioral Analysis of Culture Learning," in Richard W. Brislin, Stephen Bochner, and Walter J. Lonner, eds., *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Learning* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975), p.100.

This project was designed in accordance with the educational principle that if significant growth is to occur in the students, the learning environment must provide opportunities for them to engage in activities that require them to use the new learning. As has been stated earlier, affective learning was a primary concern.

In their classification of educational goals, Krathwohl *et al.* pointed out that the components in affective learning could be ordered on a continuum that:

> . . . progressed from a level at which the individual is merely *aware* of a phenomenon, being *able to perceive it*. At the next level he is *willing to attend to* phenomena. At a next level he *responds* to the phenomena with a *positive feeling*. Eventually he may feel strongly enough to *go out of his way* to respond. At some point in the process he conceptualizes his behavior and feelings and *organizes* these conceptualizations into a structure. This structure grows in complexity as it *becomes his life outlook* [italics theirs].[2]

The three components of the project were planned to facilitate this progression, as well as to blend affective and cognitive learning. But a particular kind of affective learning was involved: intercultural learning. According to the notion of negative feedback, one becomes aware of one's own cultural systems when one's interpretations, predictions, and modes of behavior do not work, and this occurs most frequently and forcefully in actual intercultural (including subcultural) situations. In this project, then, students placed in an unknown cultural situation were forced out of their customary style of learning and had to discover new approaches that would lead toward a different style of learning. As pointed out earlier, our education tends to emphasize convergent, logical thinking rather than divergent, comprehensive thinking. It was the latter style that the project required.

Students' Perceptions of the Project as an Educational Program

In retrospect, the students saw the pre-training seminar as providing a "mental set." Early in the field learning they were painfully aware of not knowing what to do or how to behave, and they experienced some feeling of a loss of identity. They expressed a sense of cautiousness about their behavior, about interpreting observations and experiences, and consciously thought about perception in the abstract. At the same time, they noted that during the first several weeks they were so fatigued by the many stimuli and by coping with the changes in their immediate day-to-day living (frustrations regarding transportation, no hot water, no keys, having no role, learning to know each other, and so on) that they tended to forget the pre-training. Midway in the field learning, with an occasional reminder from the instructor at first, they began to remember and could use the pre-training. They realized that initially they did not connect the problems related to their daily living with culture learning. They found that knowing terms or labels for some of

---

[2]David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Masia, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain* (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956), p. 27.

their experiences helped them to organize isolated incidents and observations into ideas about possible patterns so they could arrive at new questions and ideas. They also found that having labels for some of their feelings relieved their frustrations.

Thus, the value of the pre-training (primarily a cognitive approach) became apparent in the field and, later, in the integration seminar when the major concepts were used. The students tended to believe that the pre-training seminar standing alone would have met the same fate as some courses on culture they had completed previously: it would have been forgotten. One student was not sure "we would have been any different on our return from Guam had it not been for the pre-training which gave a mental set."

The summer field learning was generally regarded as a "total experience." Total, because, as they pointed out, "one can't go home at five o'clock, close the book, and walk away from people. You are constantly reminded that you are in another culture and that it is always with you. It is this awareness—you can't turn it off. You can't shut off the things that are uncomfortable and think about them later. They are part of you every minute." "We were forced to make use tomorrow of what we had learned today, so things 'stuck.' Back home one can retreat."

Students realized that it would be impossible to have this kind of experience at home, even with different cultural or subcultural groups because "the type of situation you are in would not call for the same type of solution and you would look at it differently and handle it differently."

Most students agreed that the field seminar was a significant factor in the summer learning because it (1) helped them go "beyond discomfort," (2) helped to organize experiences so they could be discussed, and (3) helped to create a milieu for divergent thinking by offering opportunities to share as a group and discuss differences in their observations and interpretations of the same incident or experience.

In general, students noted that without the integration seminar the field experience would have been just another experience among many. They recognized that the opportunity to reinterpret and formulate their learning was significant in helping them to see the structure, the "connectedness of things," as Bruner expressed it (see p. 34), and thus made the learning transferable for use.

Continuation of the Integration Process

After they had returned home from the field experience, the students' increased tolerance for ambiguity, the increased flexibility in work and living situations, the new confidence in themselves, and the changes in outlook on living and the world continued and, in some instances, even accelerated. For some students, incorporation of the learning experience occurred during the

[3]Jeanne Watson and Ronald Lippitt, *Learning Across Cultures: A Study of Germans Visiting America* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute of Social Research, 1955).

eight-month period after Guam. One student, showing the "sleeper" effect,[3] wrote little about change in the August summary, but in writing the spring summary said:

> I reread my August summary in preparation for writing this one and I felt alien to it . . . sounds as though I existed only in the cognitive area . . . now cognitive and affective are put together at the action level. I wish I could have . . . integrated learning throughout all the stages of the project, but I couldn't until this term. I am risking much more in meeting people and this has resulted in growth of more meaningful interpersonal relationships. Looking back at the total experience, culture learning becomes more and more meaningful. Now I feel it has given me freedom to look at and examine myself. Culture specifics which I thought important at first now have less meaning; more important is the feeling and behaving of the people of the culture. . . . I am changed in my outlook and in what I can do, but others may not be able to notice it. I enjoy what I feel.

The student's ability to risk and engage in divergent thinking are reflected in an excerpt from a teacher's statement on performance at the end of the regular practicum.

> [The student] has developed capacity to encourage . . . clients to explore areas of their situation lying beyond their statement of the presenting problems thus helping them to a level of greater understanding and use of alternatives. . . . Particularly skillful in using the clients' own language and expression system—verbal and non-verbal—resulting in genuine communication.

Another student, who had been deeply frustrated during the Guam experience because of feeling like an "outsider," wrote about the learning in a non-commital way in the August summary. In the spring summary the same student wrote:

> The most important acquisition . . . is that of a different frame of reference . . . that pervades my life, both in my social work practice and in my ordinary way of living. . . . I look at things twice—my first look is automatically from my acquired frame of reference, and the second look is from the other person's viewpoint. In terms of practice, I look at a particular . . . program from the viewpoint of . . . those affected, not from that of those who put the program together.

The Learning

Each student perceived some changes in himself as a result of his participation in the project—all in the direction of growth. The changes varied in quality, degree, and area of learning.

All of the students appeared to have blended cognitive and affective learning well enough to act upon it, to show their use of it in subsequent situations in their regular practicum, as well as to indicate certain changes in some aspects of behavior. Negative responses to systems in the new culture that were quite different from their own gradually changed to an attitude of appreciation and respect. This change was apparent in increased breadth of perception in their becoming aware of non-verbal communication; increased ability in sub-

sequent practice to communicate effectively with people in other cultures or subcultures as well as in their own; greater flexibility and increased tolerance for ambiguity shown in a more relaxed and confident approach to situations in daily living and to seemingly difficult problems; and an understanding of cultural relativity in the capacity to examine their own ways and values and see that, in the given culture, other ways and values are equally good or better. At the end of the eight weeks in Guam they did not believe that they had yet acquired a good understanding of the basic philosophy of the new culture or that they could comprehend the meaning of the pattern as a whole.

The learning is divided into three parts: culture learning; personal growth; and changing perceptions of social work. The changes overlap and are interwoven into a contextual whole. The separation for presentation is somewhat artificial.

Culture Learning

The learning experience of the students substantiates the notion that one's culture shapes and structures one's life and behavior in subtle and consistent ways. As educators, we are only at the threshold of identifying and accepting the significance of this influence.

As an illustration, take the concept of time. This was by far the most pervasively frustrating aspect of the students' learning and was the idea they worked over again and again until the very end in their search to comprehend its basic power and influence and ultimately to consider the significance this would have in social work practice.

Americans tend to do one thing at a time (when they work, it is work; when they play, it is play) and this requires scheduling. Time is understood in segments (50 minutes, an hour, and so on); it is seen as linear and goals are set in relation to explicitly stated amounts of time (the job should be finished by four o'clock; it is time for the next person's appointment). Appointments are important. Time is an essential controlling and ordering factor in industrialized countries, and activities are compartmentalized. This dominates not only business but our social relations as well. In this sense, it sets priorities in our lives since we select in relation to time what we will perceive.

The students became aware that time orders our lives and acts as an organizing frame of reference for our activities. According to their concept of a schedule, they initially had none in Guam and they found difficulty in making decisions about their activities, such as what they would do when and where; when, where, and what they would eat. They reacted as though their way of seeing and using time was the *right* way.

Their miscommunications and frustrations led them to learn that Guamanians operated within a different system of time and that this system was part of a larger cultural context. In this process they learned a great deal about their own system and got some perspective on it.

They found that Guamanians normally do not do one thing at a time. They work and play at the same time. Appointments are not important, nor are

schedules, except in certain bureaucratic organizations where people have learned the American concept of time. The work and play phenomenon appeared to the students to emphasize involvement of people as people rather than as workers. They realized that a task was to be completed but not within a scheduled time. No matter how long the line of customers, the clerk is involved with the person she is helping and completing a transaction satisfactorily with that person is important. Efficiency does not have priority as a value; interpersonal relationships do.

Planning as we know it is difficult, especially in relation to the future. It is normal to shift plans at the last moment. The time of a party may be changed. A hike may have been planned but does not materialize. On the other hand, the family may go on a trip or a picnic or fishing on the spur of the moment. Things do not stay put as they do in American culture. People are usually involved with each other and interact with several people at the same time. Waiting is not a problem; you enjoy talking with other people who are also waiting. Time is not a commodity to be lost, wasted, gained. It is not sacred or precious; it flows and has its own rhythm. This is quite different from the American concept of schedule which often seems more real than people and is what led a student to remark: "I am business- and efficiency-oriented; here people are people-oriented."

The students had achieved a new outlook on a pervasive dominant system of their own culture. They could evaluate and recognize some patterns in their own culture about which they now raised questions. This did not mean that they were derogatory, nor did it mean that they accepted the ways of the other culture as being better. Most did speak of things they wanted to modify personally, however, where they thought time had become their master.

Students recognized the broad implications of these two fundamentally different systems of time in professional practice as well as in their personal lives. One student reflected:

> . . . what I called "inefficiency" at the beginning . . . was my category for what I could see later as a . . . more relaxed pace of life. [Perhaps] this did not show itself so much while in Guam because I remained somewhat more uptight about "getting things done" than some of the others. But since I am back at home, I have been able to test myself against my previous "reality." I feel more relaxed and am not so anxious about having things just right. . . . I see how future-oriented we are. We rarely allow ourselves to live for today, nor can we be content with "being" rather than "doing." We . . . plan everything from what to do next year on vacation to what to do after dinner tonight to what we want children to be 20 years from now. . . . It occurs to me now that I have rarely passed a day in my life when I did not "accomplish" something until now. I also rarely gave myself the opportunity to reflect on much of what was happening in my life. I wonder whether many Americans do. . . . We really are slaves of the clock.

One might anticipate that the students would give considerable attention to patterns of interpersonal relationship since they were to develop non-instrumental relationships with Guamanians as part of learning the culture. In this context, culture learning and personal development were interdependent.

At first, the students categorized the Guamanian family as an "extended family system" and took for granted that they knew what this meant. For some time they made segmental observations, such as: Guamanians pay great respect to older people; the husband-wife relationship is different from that in our culture; the older children take responsibility at an early age for younger children; children get a great deal of attention from all members of the family; children enjoy going to visit their grandparents on Sunday; many grown, married children go to see their parents every day or so; people who meet for the first time begin by identifying themselves according to family and then conversation flows; youth are supposed to do what their parents want them to, e.g., with respect to dating. They observed that children and youth, and perhaps adults as well, were reluctant to draw attention to themselves as individuals "I'm shame to go on the dance floor until others are dancing"). Actually this was so for some of our students as well. Students quickly became aware of the warmth and caring in relationships among the Guamanians and of the quality of sharing. They recognized that family, church, and community or village were integrated and are determinants in the system of stable, close relationships.

All of these observations initially were just that: bits and pieces of information. After a while, the students began to see that Guamanians' behavior tends to be directed by their relationships in this steady, enduring social system—the Guamanian extended family. When they had become participants in relationships and were appreciating the warmth and caring, they began to sense the responsibilities and obligations that are inherent in this type of system. People are important; sharing is important; responsibility is important. In the integration seminar, new meanings were grasped in the context of the culture. For example, they saw that "I'm shame" is part of the pattern where each finds his individual self in relation to the group. It was at about the same time that they connected this phenomenon with goals for the Guamanians as individuals—not independence, achievement, and success in the sense that these are goals in the United States.

Initially, the students functioned in a highly ambiguous situation as they involved themselves in developing friendship relationships with Guamanians. They were acutely aware of being outsiders: "This is an inside-outside culture; if you are outside you are outside." They had no "person or channel" to help them become insiders. The Guamanians did remind them that the best way to get acquainted was to be introduced officially to a village by the commissioner. One student said:

> Though I can . . . recall the deep frustration I felt at being an outsider—deeper than anything I have ever experienced before—I would still not trade that experience for anything. It opened my eyes in a way that I doubt would ever have happened had I stayed in my own culture.

Although the students knew intellectually that they would have some failures, still, when they took the initiative with Guamanians, the emotional risk was very great. They felt shy or panicky and could not always bring themselves to take risks. They did experience rejection as well as success in rela-

tionships, and they learned from the rejections.

Comparatively speaking, developing instrumental or professional relationships carries little risk. A failure can always be rationalized that the person/family was "not ready" or "did not want help" and so on. One of the objectives of the project, however, was to help students learn to develop different skills in a variety of interaction and relationships.

We tend to assume that we can develop relationships just by being ourselves, by being frank and open and friendly. The students learned that this is not so. Our behavior may not be compatible with the cultural systems of others. In trying to behave like Guamanians, the students experienced what they called "being nothing," "sacrificing oneself," and "learning to wait." They agreed that: "You cannot be yourself and react as yourself. You have to suspend your own self, suspend your judgment, suspend your likes and dislikes so that at least you can open yourself to observe and absorb."

Some were surprised that they could and did develop meaningful relationships in a relatively short time—a tribute to the Guamanians as well as to the students. By the end of their stay in Guam, most had made warm friendship relationships with Guamanians and found them highly rewarding: "I feel at home; I feel as though I am an insider; I feel accepted." One student wrote:

> It was fun all working together in the preparation for the dedication. I feel so much a member of the village and responsible for the success of the celebration that I found myself responding to a request of the villagers to do certain things for the guests. It made me aware of how much a part of the village I have become.

This inner growth should not be taken as over-identifying with Guamanian culture.

As they came to appreciate Guamanians and to enjoy their friendship, students became increasingly aware of their own cultural ways or systems in contrast. Some tended to think the extended family system gave each child more attention and a greater sense of security than our nuclear family system. This led to exploration: Why have we in the United States developed T-groups, encounter groups, and so on? Why do we seem to have relatively few warm, sharing, natural friendships? Do our goals of "individualism, independence, and achievement—which are different from Guamanian goals—lead to a lot of lonely, left-out people?" "What would it be like to live among people whom one really knows and cares about?" At the same time, some said: "This system [Guamanian] does not allow as many choices as I am accustomed to and have learned to like." Another said: "Behavior in this type of relationship system makes me stop to think what it means in a broad context." The students thought that in the United States the priority that is given to scheduled goals may result in a lower priority on developing relationships, except those which are instrumental. They asked: What changes, if any, will modernization bring in the Guamanian relationship system—and thus in all systems of the culture?

During the integration seminar, discussion of the notion of inside-outside cultural groups brought out the fact that being totally inside a cultural group

or subgroup means that one loses out on some things because one does not perceive what is happening outside. This illustrates the narrowing or blinding effect of monoculturality.

Miscommunication and misunderstanding occurred not only because the students did not know the different time and relationship cues but also because they did not know the communication cues—either verbal or non-verbal. Indirect communication used by Guamanians—the opposite of our direct confrontation approach—left the students puzzled and uncertain. They recognized that Guamanians do not like to say no; they do not like to be turned down; they do not like confrontation and will avoid being in positions where any of these things can happen. For example, students usually did not receive direct answers to direct questions. In the integration seminar, as they reviewed their experiences in Guam they saw the indirect communication system as an integral factor in maintaining smooth interpersonal relationships—an important Guamanian value. Since they did not know the cues of indirect communication they could not follow the direction and feeling tone of the conversations and did not know whether decisions or changes in plans had occurred. Asian-American students had less frustration with indirect communication. Others agreed generally that they were more comfortable with direct communication, confrontation, and expression of dissenting views, as this offered them greater stimulation.

In the same way, they could not read the cues of the non-verbal system of communication (Hall's hidden dimension), a system likely to be more important than the spoken word. Insiders know automatically and non-consciously what the non-verbal messages are and respond non-verbally. Outsiders cannot understand and picking up only a few of the obvious manifestations does not help much. This system has to be learned in the total cultural context. Often the students were puzzled: "How can we know the difference between what is said and what is meant?" Or, "My two friends understood each other but I did not know what messages they were sending and receiving and was uncomfortable." During the integration seminar the students said that they regarded the hidden dimension as being highly important in their practice as social workers. Social work has long emphasized the importance of "body language"—only one aspect of the hidden dimension or non-verbal communication—but various mannerisms may have been assigned specific meanings that are considered as being absolute or universal rather than interpreted as part of a cultural communication system. Understanding this in the context of cultural behavior usually has not been emphasized.

Illustrations of learning in three of the other culture's systems—time, interpersonal relationships, and communication—have been used to show the development of the students' capacities to find their way into a new culture. They had learned what it is they need to learn, why they need to learn it, and how to learn it. As one student said: "Learning of this kind is more than learning a culture; it is learning to learn." They now had developed an active understanding that the various systems of a culture are woven into patterns

that differentiate one cultural group from another. A second student pointed out: "This is learning what differences as well as similarities mean; it is learning that there are different ways to perceive the world."

If the reader reacts with: "What is so great about that?" he should remember that the students moved from being insiders in their own culture to being outsiders in another and then moved toward becoming insiders in the other culture. In the process, they became aware of and evaluated their own culture in a new frame of reference yet maintained their identity with their own culture. This is the process of becoming bicultural.

Personal Growth

The circumstances of the learning situation that forced students out of their comfortable, automatic, in-group cultural ways of perceiving and behaving and into taking responsibility for developing different perceptions and a different style of learning "freed us," as one student put it, "from a set thought pattern (mostly convergent thinking)." As another summed it up: "This 'freeing' developed as it became apparent that any situation could be interpreted in more than one way and exploration of alternative explanations of phenomena occurred. . . . We put exposure and thinking together. The field learning experience in Guam provided the immediate check regarding selective perception; sharpening of analytical abilities, and learning to think divergently. The field seminar was especially important for the latter." The freeing seemed to be a center from which other changes emanated.

Generally, students expressed a sense of increased appreciation for and interest in a wide range of people, a sense of challenge (rather than avoidance and distrust) with respect to difference, an acceptance of a wide range of values and an awareness of new capacities for development in themselves, increased comfort with themselves and with risk-taking, and increased confidence in their ability to develop relationships and skills in communication. Most students referred to a gut-level understanding of the meaning and significance of suspending or of not making judgments. Some students spoke of their new lack of impatience in waiting for others, of even new patience and comfort; of less discomfort with uncertainty; some noted a sense of greater flexibility. Other attitudinal changes mentioned were: becoming less ethnocentric, becoming less judgmental, having the capacity to see other Americans in a new light, and increasing awareness of one's own cultural biases.

Values, attitudes, and habits are interdependent; students expressed their learning in ways that illustrate their interdependence. A student noted that "sharing and interdependence seem to be successful alternates to competition and individualism."

> I am more willing to share and more capable of receiving kindness without feeling obligated to return the favor immediately. I enjoy sharing now. I see it as a quality of independence, being able to give without requiring dependence from other individuals, and the same in accepting from others.

Another student said: "This is the first time I have consistently tried to put

myself in another person's shoes. I have done it sometimes previously, but not consistently." The others pointed out that this may now be easier because of the experience of building relationships without being in a professional helping role.

All students spoke of having greater confidence in themselves and some noted greater readiness for risk-taking:

> I care more for other people—and others have appreciation for me. I am more open and friendly, more spontaneous. It is easier to meet strangers and become interested in them. I can take more chances and am learning more about my abilities and potential for living, but my expectations of myself seem to become higher.
>
> • • • •
>
> I am much more able to accept solutions different from my own and to wait. Now that I really know there are different ways to handle situations, I can explore.

New understandings and meanings with respect to difference, as well as their respect for and increased comfort with it, were emphasized by the students:

> One becomes aware of the structure of one's own culture through comparison and contrast with the other culture. More important, one becomes aware of differentness, becomes open not just to one other way but to the possibility of many other ways of doing things or saying things. Culture is like language in that learning another culture opens a person's mental set to the possibility of qualitatively different ways of looking at the world and to a greater understanding of and insight into one's own.
>
> • • • •
>
> I look at differentness with interest and curiosity rather than as a threat. Now, I am apt to look at the values and meaning of an event rather than just the specific behavior involved. I am more aware of making a value judgment and more able to suspend it. I have learned to be more tentative in dealing with people in general. Because I have learned that there are other ways than mine to look at the world, I am less likely to barge in with my own ideas or ways of doing things. I notice this especially in my committee work in school (faculty and students, in a sense, represent very different subcultures). Being immersed in another culture . . . has given me a deeper awareness of complexities of communication and the necessity of taking into view the total cultural context.
>
> • • • •
>
> I am not nearly so quick to express my viewpoint. I now feel a need to stop and examine the issue, idea, question involved. As a result of this change in myself I feel I have become more tolerant of those with whom I disagree.

Although indirect references to divergent thinking appear in a number of the illustrations, sometimes students made direct references to it.

> I think I have become more tolerant of new or different ways of doing things, of living. I believe this is related to the freeing quality of divergent thinking. Once you yourself actually develop various ways of approaching a situation and learn that several ways may work equally well, you are less apt to choose the first or known solution. I stop to reconsider various avenues that I had formulated and various ways that may be possible.
>
> • • • •

> Now, it all makes sense. I try to be aware of much more of what is going on, not just focus on one thing, but look at one thing in different ways.

Some students noted that their changing attitude about differences in relation to people was a factor in how they now perceived their communication skills:

> My practicum, where I work primarily with people from other cultures, has offered the opportunity to practice the ideas I came to have in this project. I have increased my ability to use indirect communication which is their cultural way, have remained generally relaxed in my expectations, and feel that I have been increasingly sensitive to their values and perceptions of life. The cultural learning has not only maintained importance and validity for me, but has become a more comfortable and internalized part of my day-to-day work with all. . . .

Re-examining the difficulty in Guam of understanding the relationship between what is said and what is meant led a student to write:

> To understand this relationship . . . it seems imperative . . . to place things as much as possible in the context of the other culture. . . . I recall using terms such as "unreliable," "fatalistic," "lax," because I did not understand the basic assumptions that permeate action (Dorothy Lee).[4] Now my task is to try not only to understand those assumptions in other cultures but in my own as well. I am trying to get a balanced perspective on both. Lee makes the timely point that those of us who work with people from other cultures who have come to live in ours will be faced with the dilemma of supporting values that are either foreign to our own or to those of the clients. If what I experienced this summer helps with that, then this type of curriculum project has proved its worth.

Another student said:

> I have gained an awareness of the importance of metacommunication, that is, the meaning of a message is derived from the entire context within which it is given. [This may be more important in Guamanian and some other Eastern cultures than in the United States and other Western cultures]. I am aware that we communicate more by voice tone, inflection, and non-verbal cues than by the actual words themselves. I am now also aware that different cultures operate with different cues. This can be confusing and lead to bad feeling on both sides. I am now more likely to check out the meaning of a communication rather than respond with anger or withdrawal.

---

[4]Dorothy Lee, "Some Implications of Culture for Interpersonal Relations," *Social Casework*, Vol. 31, No. 9, pp. 355-360. Also, "Are Basic Needs Ultimate?" in Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray, eds., *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2d ed. rev., 1953), pp. 335-341. Pertinent to understanding here are Lee's views that "it is value, not a series of needs, which is at the basis of human behavior;" also, that culture is basic to the structuring of experience, to how we perceive and phrase to ourselves the reality we encounter. in order to understand the basis for action, it is necessary to understand how the individual views his place in the universe, how he relates himself to his job, to people, to his past and his future, and to himself; and to know that each culture structures man's place in the universe differently, that to understand personality we have to know culture. Lee says further that in interpersonal situations it is important to be aware of our cultural assumptions, our conception of ourselves, and our bases for valuation. Social workers must be aware of certain of the broad cultural bases that underlie the practice and theory of social work.

Perceptions of Social Work

Social work philosophy, goals, and methodology in the United States are based in the cultural value system of the country—perhaps in that of the white middle class. Asian social workers educated in the United States as well as American consultants in Asia have unwittingly imposed the United States philosophy, goals, and methodology on Asian social work education, programs, and practice. During the last decade, Asian countries and, more recently, the Pacific areas, have begun to recognize that this imposition is not appropriate and in some instances may actually be damaging. A similar question has arisen in the continental United States with respect to work with minority groups and subcultures. An earlier idea was that only Blacks could work with Blacks, Chicanos with Chicanos, Orientals with Orientals, lower class with the poor, and so on. In our view, this ignores a crucial problem that arises from monoculturality.

Our educational programs of largely white middle-class orientation reinforce monoculturality and serious misunderstandings arise from professional interpretations and judgments made within one's monocultural frame of reference. For example, what the students first labeled "immature and overly dependent behavior" was later understood in the context of the culture in which the individual is important in relation to the group. "Wasted time and inefficiency" was understood later in terms of different concepts of time, goals, and behavior. Some of the initial negative interpretations and judgments made by the students shifted later to respect for the other culture and an appreciation for difference.

The students, while still in Guam and in the months following, began to have some questions and different perceptions about social work:

> I have concern also . . . about a type of situation that has wider implications. I think of it in relation to the training program that is part of our agency service. What ought we to be doing (for people who will return to their own culture) in this kind of training program?

The student notes that the teaching of a specific vocational program to the young people actually occurs in the context of United States beliefs, values, goals, and life style and notes that this is difficult to avoid. Some of these are germane to our culture and not necessarily compatible with the other cultures. The student is concerned that in some ways, then, some aspects of the program may be counter-productive and asks, "What are our responsibilities? In what direction can we go to improve the situation?" The broad question is: "How can we make planners and program developers aware that we may unwittingly be doing damage?"

Several students spoke of the importance of using the natural social structures of a community, which the people already rely upon and trust, rather than introduce our ways. They compared two attempts to introduce a service program in Guam. In one village a group of statesiders advertised an "Open House" in the paper and over the radio. Their program used mainly slides, tapes, and non-local speakers. About ten people from the community came. In

another village, a person who understood Guamanian cultural structure organized an "Open House." He enlisted the co-operation of the commissioner, the priest, and others to interpret to the people. Almost the entire village came. As one student remarked, "He knew the culture, the system of communication, and how to work with it. The lesson for me was: Using your own cultural ways of doing things in another culture is probably less apt to work."

Some students discussed whether the value-goals in social casework in the United States are universal. Comparing these priority value-goals with Guamanian cultural value-goals, the students observed: "Guamanians tend to see individual worth in relation to the good of the group, and decisions are important in relation to the group. As we know it in the United States, the success of casework depends on open discussion of feelings, on independent decisions, and on direct communication. These are not priority values of Guamanians. The relationship system of interdependence, reciprocity, and obligation rather than individual achievement is important. Sharing personal matters outside the family is not the pattern. Would casework, as we know it, be appropriate in this culture or might it be counter-productive?"

The students began seeing the profession in a broader perspective. They noted that "understanding the philosophy and structure of another culture is basic to social work planning and service in that culture."

Summary of Types of Change

This summary is a way of thinking about biculturality. As the term is used in the project, it means the ability to be comfortable in two cultures (or subcultures) without discarding either and the ability to move with relative ease into a third and fourth. But the ability to be comfortable in two cultures means that one has gained a different way of viewing the world—a qualitatively different outlook on life. Perhaps no student in this project would say he had fully achieved biculturality, but a number say—and their journals and summary comments provide evidence—that they made considerable progress toward this goal.

The students had made a substantial beginning in: (1) seeing their profession in the larger world context, (2) developing qualitatively different attitudes and ways of regarding another culture, (3) seeing their own culture in a new light, and (4) developing creativity in ways of thinking and in their approach to cultural situations. Certain changes in life style occurred for some, but not all, of the students, e.g., a re-evaluation of what they wanted of themselves as opposed to what others expected of them or thought desirable for them. For some, these changes were in aspects of their personal lives and situations; for others it meant a change in plans and relationships; still others went off to other countries to explore and find work that would make it possible for them to push forward with what they had begun to learn.

The detail of culture learning has already been cited, but the overall learning—what can be generalized to other cultures—should be noted. It was

not anticipated that the students, in only two months, could comprehend the philosophy and interconnectedness of all parts of a culture. They did grasp, however, the concept of this relationship.

An overall learning objective was development of the ability to think divergently not only in interpreting people's behavior and events in Guam but also in relation to their own activities, such as taking risks in relating to people, being more adventuresome, and seeing alternative approaches. This learning was generalizable, i.e., it could carry over and facilitate their approaches in a third and fourth culture or in a subculture.

Practically all the students comprehended the carry-over effect and agreed it would be far easier to begin to operate in a new culture now than it had been in Guam. They believed they now had the knowledge, confidence, and attitudes necessary to help them wait, watch things unfold, become part of happenings without becoming tense, as they did in early experiences in Guam. They realized that they would still be "outsiders" but believed that they would not experience the physical/psychological frustrations again (at least not to the same extent), that they could become positively involved with people while suspending judgments, and that they would be challenged to learn the ways of doing this in another culture.

Changes Three and Two Years Later

The relative permanence of the changes as well as the nature of the changes that participants (now graduates holding various positions) expressed three and two years after their participation in the project are evidence that new patterns of learning were established and that the process continues. The qualities which the project sought to develop—open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity, cultural sensitivity, and awareness of one's own cultural biases—are all explicit or implicit in what participants say. One participant expressed the point of view of the 80 percent of the students who could be reached for comment:

> Social workers must work through the structures of the given culture or subculture in ways that are appropriate to that culture or subculture. This sharpens the necessity for the kind of learning we have.

Speaking of awareness, several participants commented as follows:

> Let me give you an illustration. Two of the fellows [youth in a vocational training program] were in a fight. The rules are strict and fighting is not tolerated. If they fight they have to leave. Before Guam I would have accepted the rules and would not have explored the situation. But now I do explore. When I did I learned that they were resolving a problem in the way that is appropriate in their culture. . . . These situations are hard to work out but now I try various approaches within the rules, etc.

• • • •

> Words and gestures don't mean the same thing. In communication, I generally can recognize when the response of the other person means that he has misinterpreted the meaning (and vice versa, I am more aware when I misinterpret) and I try another approach.

On confidence and self-esteem, participants indicated that:

> I found my own capacities and until you have done that you can't be so successful in helping others to find theirs.
>
> • • • •
>
> I have more confidence in what I can do and I really am more risk-taking in relationships with people. A difficult situation doesn't bother me. I know now that I can find a way out of it; I have greater capacity to do something.

Some general comments on tolerance of ambiguity, differences, and outlook merit attention:

> A lot of things that I thought were important are really trivia. I accept a frustrating situation and go do something else in the meantime. Not a problem.
>
> • • • •
>
> I see living in a different way, a less than perfect situation doesn't bother me. I'm generally more relaxed, and I'm not hung up on time and accomplishment the way I used to be. I don't need answers in the same way; I have developed some tolerance for uncertainty. I can wait better now and have patience with others. I am less uptight than I used to be.
>
> • • • •
>
> I have a new respect for some of the values of the extended family so far as children are concerned and in relation to the values of interdependence in life.
>
> • • • •
>
> All the previous talk about the need to be non-judgmental was just that—talk. I know now what it means and how hard it is. I carry around in me that people really do view things differently. I can withhold judgment now because I have inside me a respect for differences in values.
>
> • • • •
>
> I have done a good deal in re-evaluating some of my own cultural values and attitudes, also stereotypes I held. I try new experiences and am not as threatened. I'm more flexible and have a broader perspective generally. Catch myself making a judgment and I can retreat a bit and look again. I'm more observant about various types of relationships—management-worker, cliques, people who want to get ahead, friends, etc. Find that I miss the discussions we used to have—miss the stimulation of them. The experience was the most worthwhile part of my social work education and it lasts. It is still with me.
>
> • • • •
>
> The opening up of perception is major: I use the learning in everything I do. The experience is one of the most, if not the most, meaningful of graduate education.
>
> • • • •
>
> It is an integral part of me and all that I do. I said in my final summary that in that sense it was the most meaningful experience in social work education and I still believe this.
>
> • • • •
>
> Before I looked at a situation as an individual with a problem; now I look at the situation and work from there. I am more risk-taking; new demands and experiences don't throw me.

A large number of the students considered the learning in this project as either "one of the most, if not *the* most useful" or unqualifiedly "the most

useful learning" in their professional education. This spontaneous reaction deserves consideration by social work educators.

Most students considered that faculty comprehension of this type of learning is important, and many suggested that faculty members participate in such a learning experience. Sanders speaks of the value of a teacher "who has himself had experience and can communicate the relevance of such experience."[8]

[8]Irwin T. Sanders, *The Professional School and World Affairs* (Albuquerque: The University of Mexico Press, 1967), p. 243.

Chapter VI

VARIATIONS

Three variations on the original project were conducted, and these gave further insights and suggested further considerations with respect to culture learning in social work education. Two of these—the Molokai program and the Honolulu program—were carried out within the School of Social Work, University of Hawaii. The third—the Hong Kong program—was initiated by one of the authors of this book (the social worker), who worked with members of the faculty of the Department of Social Work, University of Hong Kong, to develop culture learning as an integral part of the graduate student curriculum. A great deal was learned from both the successes and the mistakes of the three variations.

The Molokai Program

For the Molokai program, the pre-training and integration seminars were similar in principle to those used for the two Guam groups. The field experience, however, was different, as will be explained in detail later. Another difference involved personnel. The authors of this book were completely responsible for the two Guam groups. In the pre-training seminar of the Molokai program, however, a newly involved social work faculty member carried considerable responsibility. He also accompanied the students to Molokai and had joint responsibility with one of the authors (the social worker) for the field seminar and the integration seminar.

After the two groups of students had done their field learning in Guam, it was decided to use a relatively more familiar culture and a site only twenty minutes by air from Honolulu—Molokai, an island in the Hawaiian chain—for the third group.[1] Two of the basic premises of the original project were

[1]Molokai has a population of about 5,000, of which a substantial proportion are Hawaiians. Although partially developed for plantation purposes, Molokai is essentially rural. Many of the characteristics of a subsistence economy have been retained and still exist, intermingled with the plantation economy. Today, however, some groups are organizing to consider ways of promoting a cash economy.

modified for this program: (1) instead of going into a different culture the students would go into a more or less familiar one, and (2) instead of going to a distant site where no family and friends would be accessible to reinforce the home culture, they would go to a nearby site where the family-friend reinforcing influence would be more difficult to control.

The purpose of these modifications was to discover what influence relative familiarity with a culture and relative closeness to home might have on student learning. It was postulated that relative familiarity might make it more difficult for the student to perceive cultural differences and develop sensitivities and that he might have more difficulty in "breaking the habit."

Two other modifications were necessary. The Queen Liliuokalani Children's Center, the Hawaiian agency which generously provided sanction for us and gave the students a great deal of help, suggested that the Molokai Hawaiians would be more responsive if the agency selected families on the basis of their willingness to have a student spend considerable time with them and if each student were assigned to a family. Thus, each student had one family; however, the families involved all knew each other well. Also, efforts to work out a living situation comparable to that in Guam failed. The students had two rooms in the rambling old local hotel.

These modifications meant that the students did not have the experience—with all its initial frustrations and demands for creativity—of developing their own field experience, as did the students in Guam, and that the living situation provided a place of "retreat" from pressures; they did not have the twenty-four-hour demand to relate to people from another culture as did the students in Guam. Even the need to develop interdependence in relation to use of cars was slightly less in Molokai because several students brought bicycles. (They could not use bicycles in Guam.) The social work faculty member who became involved in the project during this year accompanied the students to Molokai and remained there with them; the co-instructor went weekly for the field seminar. The personnel of the Hawaiian agency became friends with the students and made the agency office—a charming house—available for meetings and get-togethers.

The Field Learning Experience in Molokai

These modifications meant that the learning demands at an ego-involving level on the students in the Molokai program were considerably less than those on the students in Guam. There was little or no language barrier. As one student said, "I can talk pidgin, just as I do at home." Hawaiians were not an unknown ethnic group, as were Guamanians. Compared with the students on Guam, the students on Molokai experienced relatively few uncertainties. They did not experience loss of self-esteem, although they did not always know what to do and did make mistakes. Physical discomforts were relatively minimal. So, the beginning weeks were not pervasively or deeply disorganizing to the students in Molokai, as they were in Guam.

These students expressed their anxiety mainly in relation to meeting "my

family." This sense of "my family," of having one family, seemed to inject an element into the learning situation that was not present in Guam. The students expressed anxiety about being accepted by their given family, as different from being accepted by people of a culture. They wondered: Will the meeting go well? Does "my family" really want me? Perhaps the prearranged one-family plan was a factor in evoking the early observation that "the personalities of the families are very different."

In one instance, the host's bias concerning the student's ethnic group influenced the focus of attention and may have detracted from other learning. In another instance, a personal crisis within the family led the student to interpret family behavior during the last two weeks as possible rejection and led to anxiety as to whether the learning process had been a failure in terms of moving toward biculturality. These illustrations, which reflect normal day-to-day conditions and occurrences in family life, suggest the question: Is having all your eggs in one basket the most productive plan for field culture learning experience? Would it have been better for the students to have had a spread of several families or other types of contact, so that both family and student would feel less anxiety about making the experience fully effective?

The learning process itself was different for the Molokai students; it was not clearly identifiable. The demands for total involvement—for ego involvement—were less than in Guam. For comparative purposes, however, the field learning in the Molokai program is described here according to the same time periods that emerged in Guam.

Initial Two-Week Period

The journals during this period were primarily descriptive of what the students were doing. Some frustration was expressed as: "I am getting the impression that long delays or waits are part of life here. Many time delays, and they are sometimes irritating." Reactions to differences included: "This is a different life. Folded clothes, watched babies and soap opera. Not sure I could do it." "This is rural and I am accustomed to urban living. What do people do?" Uncertainty and discomfort were reflected in: "I am feeling uncertain whether the family wants me," and "I hope I will feel more comfortable with my family as time goes on," and "I copped out the first night and went to stay with someone I knew." One student spoke of seeking the support of another student to go to a first party where they knew no one and did not know cues or how to behave.

Positive reactions seemed to be about as strong as the uncertain, uncomfortable reactions. Students seemed to feel more comfortable. For instance: "People are nice and I am beginning to enjoy being here more and more." "At the luau I could talk with a few people I met, and I met a few more." "I helped squeeze coconut milk. Feel close to the family when working with them."

Two students, however, expressed more uncertainty and discomfort during this period than others. Considering the variation among the students, none of

the reactions had the quality of intensity that students in Guam experienced.

High school graduation was approaching when the students arrived in Molokai and they were quickly involved with their respective families in preparation for the many luaus that accompany this occasion. Cultural observations emanated from their activities in luau preparation which were new to them. The observations are scattered and fragmental:

> Apparently conflict or discord between members of a family is something to apologize for if it occurs in the presence of others.
>
> • • • •
>
> Children appear to have substantial household tasks from an early age and carry considerable responsibility. Older children are responsible for younger children. So many people give attention to each child. The system seems to work well and children feel cared for and loved.
>
> • • • •
>
> Sleeping is a social thing in my family. Earlier I would have considered 11 people sleeping in two bedrooms as substandard but my whole perception is changed. It is warm and sensible with people snuggled all over the place.
>
> • • • •
>
> Maybe the friendliness we are feeling is part of the mood of a good beginning of the pineapple season. Strong communal sense. Spirit of communal work and caring seems so good and natural in contrast to the competition on Oahu.
>
> • • • •
>
> How is it that these folks know your needs before you recognize them yourself—and know what to do without being asked? It is amazing.
>
> • • • •
>
> I am beginning to realize the value of things around us. Almost everything has a use. What I thought were weeds are food and medicine. Whole trees are useful—every part—root, wood, leaves.
>
> • • • •
>
> Most of my questions about helping with the luau are answered by watching and doing what I observe. I learned to pick opihi [fish that cling to the rocks]. The first time I was shown, but the second time I was on my own and expected to pick. I will never forget these experiences.
>
> • • • •
>
> Why is graduation so important here? The diploma seems important. What do the youth do after graduation?
>
> • • • •
>
> Ethnic feelings come out about Blacks, Japanese, and Caucasians.

All the students spoke of conversations with their families about spiritual beliefs and their importance.[2]

As would be expected at this point, a number of the observations reflect the students' own cultural frame of reference, but, in sum, reactions recorded in the journals were relatively low key. Students were active with their families and seemed to be carried along in "doing"; very little reflection was noted. The learning process itself was obscure.

---

[2] "Spiritual beliefs," as used here, is a Western interpretation of forces that are central in the life and being of Hawaiians. The expression is a poor substitute for what these forces mean to Hawaiians.

In the second weekly seminar session, the fact that frustrations seemed low key was discussed. One student then shared some stronger feelings than had appeared in the journals, then others also expressed mixed feelings about the journals and how they were to be used. This had been discussed in the pre-training seminar but the students were now reacting at an affective level. This group discussion of both feelings and experiences appeared to help the students become more involved. The instructors suggested that, as a means of increasing their circle of contacts, the students might like to strike up informal acquaintances with families whose homes they passed daily. This was vetoed on the basis that their own families might feel hurt. The students were encouraged to begin to go beyond description in their journals now, to search for the possible cultural meanings of their observations. For example, several students had noted that people did not go to work if they felt they were needed at home or to help a friend. It was suggested that this might indicate cultural values and behavior about which it would be interesting to learn more. The students were also encouraged to react to each others' journals, to broaden their perspectives, to seek differing views, and to note these for discussion.

Second Period: Third Week

Several of the students commented that the seminar session at the end of the first two weeks had been good. However, no perceptible change could be detected in the journals of the third week. No identifiable learning in terms of the objectives of the project was evident. Some students were comfortable with their families and were enjoying them. One student suddenly shifted from calling the mother in the family "Mrs. T." to calling her "Grandma," as did her family and friends. Another had "a wonderful trek to gather lauhala for weaving" and felt warmth and comfort working with the family in preparations for the luau. One indicated by implication some discomfort: "I'm more comfortable at home." In two situations, variations in the behavior of individuals in the families became a focal point in relationships, and students found it difficult to distinguish between what behavior is individual and what is cultural.

The night before the third-week seminar session, an ashtray in the girls' room broke into four pieces. No one had been using it, and the only girl in the room when it happened was asleep; the noise of its breaking awakened her. Naturally, the seminar session the next day was devoted to the spiritual beliefs of the Molokai Hawaiians. The students moved back and forth from rational to spiritual explanations and, in the end, decided to discuss it with their "families." It was clear that most of them were involved at the affective level. They wondered if one of them had inadvertently stepped on a sacred spot while gathering lauhala. Respect for and a sense of awe and identification with the spiritual beliefs permeated the session.

Third Period: Fourth and Fifth Weeks

During this period, learning at an affective level appeared to be dulled and little introspection could be noted. Even frustration seemed to carry minimal feeling:

> The hardest thing for me was to get on a friendly basis with each person in the household.
>
> • • • •
>
> This is a different environment from the city and doesn't meet what I have learned to think are my needs—loss of privacy, some kinds of relationships which I miss, and certain kinds of entertainment. This is probably a relative thing in that I consider my living in Honolulu utopian and so I define it as better. I like urban life and this is rural. Not serious.

Other students referred obliquely to loss of privacy. Some of the young people from the families would drop by the students' rooms, and one student said, "I left the task of entertaining to the others and went to bed." Another spoke of feeling the need to be alone.

The impression gained from several journals is best expressed by one student who said that things were going well, but "now that we know our families, there isn't much to do, and I feel I am on a plateau." In general, responses and interactions seemed to be warm and comfortable and taken for granted. Students tended to accept what the families said without becoming involved in the kind of communication that explores meanings. In one instance, a family member tried to move to a deeper level of involvement by asking what a student was learning.

The students talked about cues, but without involvement; either they thought they knew the cues or were not actively troubled about whether or not they understood. Actually, some of the experiences related in the journals showed that the families were giving cues but that, for the most part, the students seemed unaware of them; at least they usually did not pursue them. One student did actively struggle with cues. Another was aware of being too reticent to ask exploratory questions or to make comments that would lead to deeper meanings.

Three students had colds or chills and fever for several days during this period. All were busy helping families with specific chores and preparations for a second round of luaus. By this time the families assumed that the students knew how to do certain tasks. Several students were taking advantage of opportunities to learn various crafts or to attend a class in Hawaiian culture offered by a knowledgeable Hawaiian.

Cultural observations were few and tended to be at an obvious, unrefined level.[3] For example, several students gave illustrations showing why they thought Molokai Hawaiians find it easier to think in terms of the immediate future than to engage in long-term planning: when a need arises, people will help each other. One family that was planning systematically and experiment-

---

[3]We hope the Molokai Hawaiians will forgive us for what we could not learn in the time available.

ing with certain crops in an effort to develop ways to earn a living when the pineapple industry is phased out was the exception.

One student asked: "What do material possessions mean to Molokai Hawaiians? They seem not to be disturbed when things are lost or discarded. Seems as though possessions have no value except that of filling a need of the moment. This is different from the usual United States culture." This same student was puzzled that one mother suited time to her own needs but expected the student to operate in the United States orientation of "being on time" and was upset when this did not occur. The student wondered: "Is this an individual variation or a cultural pattern of expectation? If so, why should time be one thing for her and another for me?"

It was also noted that the young people tend to go around, not in pairs, but in groups.

In one instance a Hawaiian ignored a question as his way of saying no, but the student did not appear to read the cue.

The journals and the seminar sessions affirmed a beginning awareness, expressed by one student:

> I'm just seeing bits and pieces. This week I seem to be doing things but not thinking about them. Maybe I'm just not actively perceiving much. It is difficult to reflect on my experiences now. Maybe I am experiencing cultural rejection of cues. Maybe I know, but I don't like some. I'm not sure. Maybe I'm expecting something because I'm accustomed to it in my culture. Maybe this is the problem—my own cultural values and expectations.

When an instructor suggested that this recognition is a good first step in learning, two students responded positively but said that they would not have understood if it had not been pointed out to them. Another said, "I'm not sure whether we were ever really guests, but now we are so much a part of the family that we don't reflect, don't question and explore, and so we don't move in our learning."

It is clear that the students were aware that something was missing in their learning at this point. Two students said the seminars were getting better each time. "We are getting involved," they said. If it is true that the students as a whole were not affectively and actively involved, why was this so? Or was some type of learning going on that was not yet consciously identifiable by the students themselves and, therefore, could not be articulated?

Fourth Period: Sixth to Eighth Weeks

There were slight differences in the journals of this final period. The students were busy with their families and feeling sad about having to leave their friends soon. Relationships with the families, with the Center staff, and with related others were warm and caring and had a distinct impact on the students. All felt the families had given them an unusual experience. One said, "I doubt that I could open my home and family to someone for the summer as they have done." The families made consistent and generous efforts throughout to make the experience valuable. In a few instances, they seemed

to be pushing the students to become more analytical about their learning: "What do you think you are learning?"

During the pre-training period the students had been warned that because they already had a casual acquaintance with Hawaiian people and because they were not far from home they might tend to make easy assumptions, that differences might be less apparent and more subtle and that they might feel at home and therefore less open to examining the Molokai Hawaiian culture and their relation to it. This seemed to have meaning for them only near the end of the field period.

During the last session of the field seminar, when the students were asked to be analytical about themselves, two of them spoke of having been "thrown into the environment with no clues about what they were supposed to do." In retrospect, however, they understood the reasons. In general, the students seemed to be developing awareness during the last two weeks and moving into a more active learning stage:

> The more I learn, the more there is to learn. I'm just beginning to make some progress. You begin to see what you haven't even explored. At the beginning I didn't realize how much this involves, but the more I get into it, the more I see.
>
> • • • •
>
> The experience of talking with people I've never met before and then going on to try to understand is really tough.
>
> • • • •
>
> It was hard but I'm glad I did it. I would have lost out if I hadn't. I can look at myself now. I started out on a certain level and I haven't changed that much perhaps.

Reviewing perception, one student said:

> I think I may have boxed myself in. I would find an answer to a question and drop it rather than looking again, exploring alternatives, etc., as had been suggested. For example, I thought T. always had everything under perfect control. I'm just beginning to learn the difference between what one says and hopes and what occurs in living. I think I've been hearing what I wanted to hear and have not been seeing either because what I saw didn't always coincide with what I would have liked to see the person do.

With respect to spiritual beliefs:

> I came with a scientific attitude and I feel less certain now because I think there are things that even science can't explain.

One student who had worked hard at learning throughout the entire period, had been thoughtful, and had some insight into the meaning of divergent thinking and creativity weathered the effects of a personal crisis in the family during the final weeks of the stay with only a temporary loss of self-esteem.

In general, at this stage of learning there seemed to be an awakening of cultural awareness and sensitivity. The students had developed relationships and friendships with the people; they had developed respect for them and their philosophy of life. Two questions remained, however: Is this enough? Has the affective involvement been such that the learning will be transferable for use in social work practice?

That the students did not appear to develop earlier an inquiring, exploring

attitude is no reflection on them or on their respective families. It seems rather to have stemmed from the modification of basic premises in the original project.

The faculty member who stayed with the students on Molokai did go through a learning process somewhat similar to that of the students in Guam. For the entire period he was away from his wife of nineteen years, he was without the reaffirmation of his own culture, habits, and so on. He consciously set up certain situations for himself. He spent time in learning Hawaiian crafts, in becoming friends with people and participating in various social and community activities. He experienced some feelings of discomfort and tension (even before he left home) and a sense of knowing less and being less sure of himself than formerly. Then gradually came the excitement—and fun, he said—of being able to question things he had taken for granted as "right," of seeking alternatives, of sometimes not finding answers immediately or at all. He understood the meaning of behavior in ways he had not thought about before; he questioned priorities and values. He questioned limitations in the applicability of social work methods in different cultures, and he began to re-examine theories and see differences more acutely. In his words: "The experience has changed my behavior, my approach to situations, my teaching, my way of seeing everything, my views about things, and I am happy about it."

This faculty member had several advantages. He had studied in more depth the theoretical basis of the project and had read more widely on the subject. He had had weekly conferences for a year with one of the authors of this book and occasional discussions with the other. He had some conviction about the premises underlying the project, such as a recognition of the values accruing from being in a new culture without the supports of one's own culture and from an openness to learning. His motivation was clearly defined: he was eager to find out whether this learning would affect his views as a social work educator. Perhaps he built in his own tension.

The Integration Seminar

The integration seminar seemed especially important in the Molokai program. The students used several sessions to assess their experience. The following composite of reflections reveals some of their insights:

> This is a process of giving up old ways of learning, becoming more open-minded; you find new ways of behaving.
>
> • • • •
>
> Culture learning as I know it now, you've got to be part of it. Otherwise it's just talking. You can read and study but until you are part of it you can just stereotype or categorize it.
>
> • • • •
>
> I see culture learning now in terms of emotional involvement. Without emotional involvement you may say, "Hawaiians do this or that," or they "use this or that," but it doesn't mean much.
>
> • • • •
>
> I think I could have gotten more out of going to Guam. I had expected to be a lot more "freaked out." I'm not a masochist, but it would have been

good to be in something that would have turned me around completely. I think we would have been more resourceful, would have had to think more, and be more fully involved. Too many escape valves and comforts in Molokai.

• • • •

I think you've got to go away and be somewhat divorced from what you have back home. I think it has to be away from home.

Some felt that all students in social work should have this kind of learning opportunity; others thought it should be provided only for those with an interest. Two comments have relevance in this context:

Some things in the regular curriculum you may need but may not use. This experience would be hard not to use.

• • • •

In practicum you are always supervised and you are task- and method-oriented. It definitely wraps you into a tight framework in which you have to function. That is totally different from this type of learning.

Summary of Overall Learning

The integration seminar and the August and spring summaries tell more about the student learning in the Molokai situation. Somewhat to our surprise, all the students expressed the belief that the project provided the opportunity for a unique and valuable experience, which some thought should be available to all social work students.

Cultural observations, now stated more broadly, remained isolated in the sense that most were specifics and not recognized as components of significant interdependent cultural systems which direct behavior. To illustrate:

Spiritual beliefs seem very much a part of everyday life. At times people are vague and don't discuss plans. This appears sometimes, at least, to be a built-in feeling that the spirits may be eavesdropping. The beliefs appear to constitute a kind of control that is similar to that of religion.

• • • •

Relation to the universe is that of respect, appreciation, and harmony. The sea, the land, the vegetation, etc., all take care of us and in turn we take care of them, do not misuse them. [Perhaps the Hawaiian would say nature is the soul.]

• • • •

The concept of the lazy Hawaiian seems inaccurate. Achievement, as we know it, seems less important to the Molokai Hawaiian. He will work gladly all night or for long hours if he feels he is trying to help someone. He likes to work in groups—not so much in organized groups, however—and prefers to have the motive of helping others, not just himself. He feels the work then is more apt to be successful. People say the Molokai Hawaiians in general are not businessmen, and don't like what it requires.

• • • •

There may be rivalries or jealousies in work but they were not apparent to the outsider.

• • • •

There does not appear to be a sharp distinction between work time and "free" time, as we have in our culture.

• • • •

> Sharing and interdependence are pervasive in Molokai Hawaiian living, the idea of exchange: I fix your engine, you give me onions which you grow. There appear to be obligations also as an aspect of sharing in families.
>
> • • • •
>
> There are certain times for certain things that are related to the universe; time is also when one feels ready; it is not scheduled as in the United States culture; punctuality depends on the situation or occasion.

These observations remained unconnected and were not explored in the cultural context for meanings. The question is whether generalizations will emerge later for the students and become transferable in the sense of moving toward becoming bicultural.

During the integration seminar the students showed a lack of clarity concerning their own personal growth. The limitations in cultural learning may have been a contributing factor. By the time they wrote their spring summaries, however, all had clarified their ideas. Perception and confidence—a blend of cognitive and affective learning—were the principal areas in which students experienced personal growth:

> Part of the change is in the way you look at things. I have a greater realization that people do things differently and have different reasons for doing so. They see and have experiences in different ways from mine. I have developed some awareness and recognition of my limited perspective, my biases, standards, and "one-way" perception. Have a long way to go to become bicultural, but the project was a tremendous experience. I still tend to connect with people in my practicum through my own frame of reference . . . but am more conscious of my relationship and work with people, more aware of cultural differences and find it easier to relate and participate with others. Although I still feel like an "outsider" the experience has given me a bit more confidence in myself when I'm in a different cultural group and lots more confidence in my behavior because my perceptions are more accurate than previously. Am developing better perception in communication and in seeing patterns of behavior in people. I have more confidence in working in my own culture, but, if I worked in another, I believe I would have more confidence in myself than before. I feel that in practicum I have not used the learning as much as I expected, but this seems to be related to agency policies and procedures.
>
> • • • •
>
> I am more relaxed with people in groups. I haven't used opportunities in classes with students from other cultures—we all seem to go into our own groups. In practicum, I found I could take more risks and came to have confidence in myself that was noticeable to others. Have used the experience . . . in learning one subculture in practicum, and am now doing so in another. The more different ways one sees needs expressed, the more divergent one's mind becomes in looking for new, possibly unfamiliar, modes of expression.

Modification in attitudes and behavior that were reflected in the summaries suggests that, for some, the learning took root *after* the field learning period:

> I thought what I would learn was to make working with Hawaiians easier. I didn't think what I would learn could be generalized to other cultures and situations as well. But a week after returning from Molokai I was writing testimony for . . . mental health plans. An important part of my

critique dealt with the lack of concern reflected in the proposals for cultural diversity. This I'm certain would not have appeared in my testimony had it been written before the Molokai experience. This is, I think, the single most important learning—my newly developed interest in and appreciation of cultural diversity.

A second expectation in which my learning was almost the exact opposite was my . . . recognition of the way in which culture is reflected in the family unit. I thought the topics we used as props to help us get started were boring or uninteresting. I was interested in community organization. In spite of this, I was fascinated with the way a family group operated, especially in relation to child-rearing practices. I began to see that unless I knew the family structure of a community in which I was working, anything I could say about community organization . . . would run the risk of being at best only a half truth.

Many of my activities this year involve cross-cultural contact. Is it coincidence or result? One thing I know, I can try now to conceptualize about cultural differences, whereas in the past I just had the habit of appreciating them as an array of discrete phenomena. I have a better appreciation of some of the more subtle differences. Have found that by utilizing the method of searching for and asking . . . exploratory questions, I am better able to delve into these differences. In general, the project has opened up areas of interest that were previously closed in my mind. Maybe there is truth to the proposition that contact with a different culture can broaden one's perspective. I feel that no closure has taken place in a wonderful, formative experience.

Perhaps it is useful here to cite from both the August and spring summaries of one student in order to show the nature of the development over a period of time following the field learning experience. In the August summary the student said:

I learned a good deal about myself—personal strengths and weaknesses. Although in the past I had made a number of changes of environment, including foreign countries, I was unaware of the phenomenon of bicultural experience. I believe the way I often felt on Molokai was in part attributable to the beginning stages of a bicultural experience. I had periods of uncomfortableness during the first part of the project . . . with patterns of behavior I used that did not work in this culture, e.g., listening but not being able to understand the meaning of what was being said. When a Hawaiian child says, "I like chips," the correct answer is not, "Yes, I often enjoy them myself," but, "Here, have some." I learned that I rely heavily on a city style of life and large amounts of stimuli from which I can choose—it gives me the effect of being in control of my environment. When this is absent I feel less effective. . . . The insight gained as well as the process of going through this were valuable.

I dealt with some of my prejudices regarding locals! During the time I have lived on Oahu I have had surprisingly little contact with local people and thought it was because they wanted nothing to do with this "Haole"—a counter-defense kind of thing—and I began to have a feeling of distrust that goes with "differentness." The sustained relationships on Molokai enabled me to get well beyond this impression to find warm-hearted people willing to form relationships. Time after time I found people who had initially seemed reticent were really shy and I had construed it as hostility.

(95)

I gained some language skills, my speech is different now. Also, awareness of differences in the way people in this culture relate to each other. "Talking story" as an interactional technique is new to me and I need to develop it if I plan to work here. Social work, while difficult enough, is made easier because one has a role which . . . gives the worker relatively clear patterns of interaction to follow and is goal-oriented. Even in situations that are less clear, a worker usually represents some agency which helps to lend structure to the situation. On Molokai, we were without a role or structure. A valuable learning experience. By preventing the use of previously acquired habits, I was forced to be creative in situations, to devise new ways of relating to people in order to learn their culture. . . . Instead of interviewing people . . . I began to see the value of seeing people in their homes, doing some of their tasks with them. Through watching soap operas with them I learned a good deal about how they felt about life and its various problems. Some social workers say that in the final analysis it isn't the social worker's role or the agency, but the quality of the relationship . . . which expedites the solving of problems. If this be so, the project gave the students a unique opportunity to test this skill in relationship building. . . . Furthermore, the "one-down" position is eliminated—each party in the relationship is equal and in a similar situation. It might be desirable if every social work student were given this type of experience.

In the spring summary, this student said:

This process of moving toward biculturality is valuable; it leads to self-examination and creativity if one is to fit the new situation. This awareness of my old patterns of behavior and process of self-examination have stuck with me since Molokai and I have made some major changes in my living. For instance, I have far less need of privacy, and I live more simply.

As for "rolelessness"—I believe it released untapped creativity and made me less afraid to take risks. In the fall, I asked to change my practicum from casework to community organization. I selected a project that provided little structure, relatively few guidelines, and was a new venture. But I had less initial discomfort than formerly and was able to function at a level sufficient to get the job done. I doubt I would have undertaken such a mission had it not been for the culture learning project. . . . I think I have learned a bit about how to work with people of another culture, e.g., am aware of my own culture's need for delineation, its concept of time, use of personal space, etc. I am aware of not attempting to impose these (my own) on people of another culture, but first to learn their concepts and expectations, and then to use this material in planning action. The concept of what a group is for is important in working in a culture. A social worker on Molokai who wished to start organized activities for teenagers, for example, would be ignoring the natural structures. Whether the central pattern is independence or interdependence is another important dimension. The importance of using existing social structures and institutions must be considered.

My original conclusion still holds: such a project is important in the educational preparation of social workers since they must get involved with people from various cultures and subcultures other than their own. An experiential program such as this project may, I believe, have more lasting effects on a worker's skills than the standard academic program. If possible, I would like to see it built into the basic curriculum.

(96)

Given variations among the students, it is fair to say that learning for the Molokai group was, in general, at a more elementary level than for the Guam groups. Deep frustrations, discomfort, and loss of identity were not inherent in the Molokai situation and students were not forced out of their customary style of learning. In the modified situation, the learning process was slow compared to that in Guam, and the modifications acted as deterrents to learning. This was especially noticeable with respect to culture learning. For example, relative familiarity with the culture may have had a deterring effect as far as awakening the students to the need to explore ideas, values, attitudes, interests, and behavior in the other culture and, in the process, to develop an awareness of their own culture. Instead, it seemed to reinforce the pattern of taking things for granted. In other words, there was little culture shock, which may be essential to cross-cultural gut-level learning.

Not having to develop their own learning opportunities further reduced tension for the students, which is important to the development of a new style of learning. Concentrating each student's experience primarily with one family may have been a further deterring influence in the cultural aspects of learning. However, having no professional role—a factor present in both the Molokai and Guam programs—may have created sufficient initial anxiety to activate learning, and it may also have oriented that learning toward changes in perception and confidence as principal outcomes.

It may be that a process of becoming sensitive and aware has been set in motion, and that it will have sufficient force to create enough continuing discomfort and tension so that this learning will develop and become a habit. If there is a "sleeper" effect, then we can expect that the longer the interval of time, the greater the change will be. These students have been graduated only a few months and there is no way of knowing at this time.

The Honolulu Program

During the second year of the project a variation was tried in Honolulu. Fifteen students coming into the School of Social Work who had indicated international/cultural interests were enrolled in this variation. Some were local, some were from the continental United States, and some were from other countries.

The original plan for this variation was as follows:

1. These students would not enroll, at least not during the first term, for any social work methods course. Instead, they would enroll in a course that was basically like the pre-training seminar for the Guam program but included assignments and exercises to provide practical application of some aspects of the theoretical themes.

2. The regular practicum (two days a week) would be modified so that the students would not have specific task- and method-oriented assignments in an agency, neighborhood, or community. Instead, they would have the opportunity to develop their own approaches in becoming acquainted in various roles

with a variety of people. They would not have the usual professional role or assignments. They would, however, have to be assigned to an agency so they would have a supervisor and their presence in the neighborhood and community would be sanctioned. This unstructured experience was to have similarities to Guam in that students were to be encouraged to form relationships with people as equals and engage in divergent thinking.

3. For a two-week period during the interval between first and second semesters, each student would be assigned to a family—not of his own ethnic group but, insofar as possible, of an ethnic group of his choice—with whom he would develop a friendly relationship (not on a professional-role basis), participate in the daily living activities, and learn what he could about the cultural frame of reference of that group. He might become acquainted with friends or relatives of the family as well.

Three local agencies gave excellent co-operation in locating families and making the original contacts between students and families. This task was beyond the call of duty and was performed generously, warmly, and thoughtfully by agency staff.

4. Students would continue the course for a second term, which basically would be like the integration seminar in the original project, and would aim at cognitive development of divergent thinking through a comparative study of the literature of two cultures. The final unit in the second term would offer the students an opportunity to identify and evaluate their own cultural awareness and their sensitivity to other cultures as reflected in their views about social work and their activity in the regular practicum.

5. During the second term, those students who wished to do so would take a methods course and all would have a regular practicum.

This variation injected a different priority value regarding an approach in professional learning and challenged priority values of long standing. It was, therefore, heavily dependent upon substantial and active support by the faculty. Support had been obtained in principle but could not be sustained in practice, in part, at least, because of the deep challenge to priority values.

Difficulties were encountered in carrying out the plan for a modified practicum. Planning and discussion sessions were held regularly throughout the term with those field supervisors who had become involved in the program. Despite their willingness, some felt restricted by their agency policies and, perhaps, did not have the conviction needed to make them comfortable in an unstructured practicum situation and to risk whatever it might involve with their agency. (This is not intended as a criticism; it is, rather, a recognition of basic difficulties.) We were, after all, asking these supervisors to make basic changes in their work with the students, and this was not easy for busy people to do. Perhaps we did not give them the support they needed in the form of discussion sessions, including background on the theoretical basis.

The plan, then, for a modified practicum was only partially functional. Those students whose educational backgrounds were highly structured and

emphasized conformity and the need to arrive at definite and logical answers were frustrated. Others, who wanted very much to try the plan as proposed, were also frustrated by the limited extent to which it turned out to be operational.

It became clear during the first term that the two-week exposure (in the interim between first and second terms) to another ethnic group could not be considered as part of the school's regular practicum. Although academic credit would be given as part of the course, it was regarded by a number of students as an "extra" and they reacted negatively. In addition, throughout the term the students had to cope with feelings of difference and some isolation from other students as well as with their own uncertainty. The supports available were insufficient to help them turn their frustrations in a positive direction for learning. Because of the negative reactions of some of the students in the class, another compromise was made: the second-term course was made an elective for those who wished to continue. One-third of the group (five students) chose to continue and one other student applied for the original project in Guam. Some others in the continuing group wished to do the same but could not because of limitations in the amount and terms of the grant.

We knew from the beginning that the two-week field exposure would be too short, but this was the only way possible within the curriculum structure, so we tried it to see what could be learned. Just less than a third of the students experienced the discomfort of not knowing the cues, of realizing their normal ways of operating did not work; they recognized the challenge and risk of trying—in the status of student learner—to develop friendly relations with people they did not know. Some students did not become involved at an affective level; instead, they had a comfortable experience, learning some culture specifics with probably no carryover effect. About a third rejected the experience as being no different from what they were already accustomed to, and thus did not become involved in learning.

Outside pressures on the students enrolled in this variation—and therefore not enrolled in a course in social work methods—were keenly felt and contributed to their frustrations. In an effort to deal positively with some of the frustrations, we interjected several method-related sessions into the first-term course. This was a mistake. The content of these sessions was not integral to the content and objectives of the course and tended to confuse the instructors as well as the students, to obscure the objectives, and probably to deter learning.

Despite these difficulties, the students who completed the second term had opened for themselves the door to cultural awareness and new sensitivities. Some affective as well as cognitive learning had occurred. Because this variation could not be carried out as planned, the experiential learning was reduced to an insignificant component. Whether the limited learning will have impact in their later practice is open to question. All students who completed the second term indicated that, although the program had been enriching, they wanted and needed more. In our view, this variation as originally planned

should be tried out in an atmosphere of support in order to find out what learning might occur.

The Hong Kong Program

Initially, the Hong Kong program was to be similar to the Guam program, but involving students in the Department of Social Work, University of Hong Kong. Certain difficulties made it necessary, however, to have the field learning not in another country or culture as had been planned but in one of the Hong Kong subcultures in a remote fishing village on another island. This was a fairly closed and isolated community of about 15,000 land and boat people, 45 percent of whom had lived there for generations. In all other respects, the program followed that of the original. The three learning components were the same: the pre-training seminar, the field learning experience with the accompanying field seminar, and the integration seminar.

Two faculty members of the Department of Social Work, University of Hong Kong, had been interested in this entire project from its inception and the plan was to implement the program in their school in 1975. Planning sessions had been held by the social work author with faculty members whenever possible, and at least four members of the Hong Kong faculty became involved in the project.

As part of its regular curriculum, the Department had a ten-week block field placement in the summer term between the first and second years of the program of study, and it was decided to use this period for the field learning. Not all the field supervisory people were convinced that this would be productive, but they agreed to try it.

One of the authors of this book (the social worker) was invited to teach the pre-training seminar in Hong Kong in the spring term of 1975. Two members of the Hong Kong faculty* (both of whom had previously been provided with a detailed description of the original project, including the theoretical basis) participated in the seminar, and we held weekly conferences. Another member of the faculty ferried with us to various islands in search of a site that would provide as different a subculture as possible for the summer field learning. Once the site was selected, the faculty members obtained the village authorities' sanction for the endeavor. Living quarters for the students and the accompanying faculty member were the upper floor of a stone house on a hillside, about a ten-minute walk from the center of the village. Their life style, except for the luxuries of electricity and running water outside the house, was much the same as that of the people in the village.

The content of the pre-training seminar remained essentially the same as for the original project, but it was examined and revised in terms of the question: What areas are based in Western cultural philosophy and theory? For example, Maslow's theory of motivation appears to be based, in part at least, on Western cultural concepts (emphasis on individuality, for instance) and is not

*Miss Hei-man Lee and Mr. Kenneth K.L. Chau.

necessarily appropriate in the same way to the Hong Kong culture.

The theory's Western base was noted and it was used to accentuate differences which might be significant. We used the concept of two sets of forces in man—one for safety and one for growth—which seemed appropriate to all at this time. The theoretical material on culture was retained: selective perception; categorization, interpretation, and stereotyping; language, especially words; cultural bias, cultural delimitation, and biculturality; culture from inside out and outside in; what it means to learn another culture; and materials on field methodology.

Several types of assignments intended to apply theory to real-life situations were used to engage the students on an affective level in recognizing the cultural selectivity of their perceptions. Several were in-class exercises. In one assignment, the students went out in pairs to observe a group of not more than three people. Their separately written observations, when compared in class, averred their selective perception and biases in interpretation. Another in-class exercise, designed to create awareness of inside-outside aspects of Chinese culture, was a discussion of *The Chinese Looking Glass*, by Bloodworth (an outsider writing about Chinese culture), a book to which students and faculty had reactions ranging from negative to positive.[4] Another exercise, designed to broaden perspectives and point up biases in readiness for "breaking the habit" of one's culture, was the comparison of two short stories from other cultures.

It should be noted that in the pre-training seminar the students were learning in their second language and that the outside instructor was learning from them. This was ideal for helping all participants see that words, concepts, and behavior mean different things in different cultures, i.e., that meanings have their basis in the philosophy and total life pattern of a given culture. The instructor had to learn the students' culture, and the students became aware of their own Chinese values, interpretations, and ways of behaving as they corrected the instructor's interpretations. They also learned that they themselves did not always agree on interpretations.

Because the students in the Guam program had suggested a more concentrated time period for the pre-training seminar, i.e., a period shorter than the regular 14-week semester, we tried nine two-hour sessions. In the instructor's view, one more session would have been useful.

The integration seminar is in progress as this book is being written. It follows the general plan of the original project, that is, integration and conceptualization of the learning. Excerpts from an interim report prepared by a Hong Kong faculty member at the end of the field learning period are included here for purposes of comparison and to show what had occurred to this point:

> This requirement [no professional role] proved to be quite difficult . . . at the beginning. . . .[The students] found it harder to BE local residents

[4]Dennis Bloodworth, *The Chinese Looking Glass* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1967).

than to DO something for them. . . .The emotional experience of "living in a new culture" came slowly and often painfully. But this is what affective learning is about, and through the successes and failures of being able to function in a different subculture that learning could be maximized.

Evaluation . . . now is, of necessity, tentative since the students have not yet begun the integration seminar. . . . The final evaluation will be significant since it has important implications for future curriculum planning. . . .

There is no doubt that certain changes have already taken place in the students. . . . For example, they began to question openly their own middle-class values in relation to education, aspirations, and basic needs. They showed some understanding of the value orientation of the people in [the village] and became slower to judge, more ready to listen and wait. Most of them did overcome their anxiety in talking to the best people and farmers who, in their opinion, are much less educated than they (and therefore should not be wiser than they are!). They did, in fact, begin to "talk their language," learned to appreciate their slower pace of work and a very different concept of time. Positive feedback and strong support to continue with the project prevailed in their analytical summaries written a month after returning from the field. . . .

We did not attempt to make a [village] farmer out of a HKU student, but the experience helped him learn new ways of thinking, feeling, believing, and acting. His unconsciously learned values became explicit and were challenged.

The following quotes from the students' analytical summaries—written in English, their second language—give an indication of the impact of the experience and reflect some of their learning:

Before [the project], T. was not a place I knew anything about . . . [but] until I got down to share and experience with them did I understand how little I knew of T. culture and people.

• • • •

The culture learning program had indeed given me a chance to explore into my own cultural pre-suppositions, my own standard of evaluation . . . besides learning to be sensitive to other (cultural) systems. I am now ready to re-examine my ways and to modify my approaches to people.

• • • •

I feel the 10-week experience of living together with T. people was very helpful in our professional training. The close contact and interaction with T. people not only made me more aware of myself and my values, it also taught me what was acceptance. It is a process that demands a profound awareness of the values, needs, and purposes of other people. . . .

• • • •

I was able to see things in wider scope . . . I put great effort into trying to feel as they [T. people] felt, and try to appreciate their ways of coping with situations. So in preparation for my future career, the change in me at this stage helped me to be more tolerant and flexible.

The faculty member's report notes that:

If problem-solving is also seen as part of their learning, then certainly all the students had encountered some problems which called for new approaches on their part. One student remarked: "When I arrived at T. I was lost and could not find a means to establish an identity for myself. I

had no . . . role except that I was a student. I had no support and nobody to depend on, which made [the task] challenging. I had to start from the very beginning. . . ."

Being labelled an outsider was another problem. One student was most concerned about their presence in a strange community and was worried how people will regard them. However, toward the end of the period, this student was popular with both old and young at T. and was much relaxed in interacting with people from very different background. . . .

Another student reported:

"The first few weeks I found myself a little bit out of place though they were all Chinese. . . . I was too anxious and asked too many questions that made them a bit suspicious." In fact, in the third week a rumor started in the community that the students were investigators. By that time they had gained enough confidence and sensitivity to handle the situation calmly and skillfully. As a result, they soon regained all the trust and acceptance of the people. When the students were almost ready to leave, the people . . . said that they will miss [the students] very much and the young people had a farewell party to wish them speedy return. . . .

In my view the experiment (to this point) has achieved at least the following for the students: it has (1) loosened up old attitudes and biases; (2) sensitized them to their own cultural orientations as well as to new perceptions of cultural differences; (3) developed skills in communication with people from different backgrounds and with different [ways] of thinking; (4) developed a flexible and creative use of self in adjusting to new environment and in problem-solving.

At first, the students tended to think they understood Chinese and all Chinese subcultures. But the experience proved that this was not so. They are more prepared now to re-examine their own perceptions and are cautious to make generalizations. Admittedly the . . . period is too short for the students to adapt to and to learn a new culture at the same time. But this is not a crucial point. The [period] was sufficient at least to give the students the feeling of a different subculture and to learn to respond to it. They have faced a challenge to their cultural and individual ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. This, in my opinion, is a very important part of the process for professional training.

The Department has now made this program a part of its regular curriculum for all students. The field experience for the next group will be carried out at greater cultural and geographical distance from Hong Kong, and the thirteen students in this next group are reported to be eager and enthusiastic. The field supervisors of the Department are supporting the plan. Since the number of students will be larger than last year, certain arrangements will be slightly different, but the project will remain the same in principle. The Department will then have two types of field learning sites for comparative purposes.

Members of the faculty are adapting pre-training material and supplementing it with material from their own culture. Some culture permeation is reported in other courses as well. The two faculty members who worked most closely with the program said recently, "Your project is over but the seed is planted and growing here with us." After reading part of this manuscript they remarked that their own learning in this experience with the students parallels that of the faculty member in the Molokai program.

Until it is possible to study the data on the completed experience of the first Hong Kong group of students, comparisons of learning with the Guam program cannot be made. The brief materials available suggest that the Hong Kong students, like the students in the Guam program, experienced some loss of identity, that they learned from the impact of some culture shock, including that of a different cultural level of speech, that they learned from the need to develop their own learning situation, from having no professional role, and from the situation of being outsiders. To a large extent those elements were missing in the Molokai program. Are these, then, essential elements in the kind of learning desired? Further experience can be expected to shed light on this point.

The three variations described in this chapter have helped immeasurably in evaluating the project and in highlighting its implications for professional education in social work.

Chapter VII

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Cross-cultural sensitivity is one factor responsible for the growing recognition that bi- and multi-culturality are becoming basic equipment for people in the professions, business, industry, government, politics, and, not least, education.

It was concern about the limitations in communication that confront the social worker in all his activities—whether in his own or another culture—that led to the development of this project. These limitations, some of which derive from monoculturality, may cause serious misunderstandings, failures, and conflicts of which the social worker is unaware. These limitations are evident not only in direct communication with people but also in the development and interpretation of policies, programs, and services that do not take into account the cultural values and ways of the group they are designed to serve.

As we have already pointed out, man tends to become monocultural because he has experience in common with others in the cultural or subcultural group of which he is a member. These common experiences produce shared perceptions, "some conditioned by the social and manmade environment and some by the natural environment."[1] Man absorbs and learns on a nonconscious level the attitudes, values, and behaviors of his group. As he matures, all these influences come into play in determining how he perceives and responds to the world and others. Walsh, writing about intercultural education, says:

> The monocultural person tends to accept without question the goals and objectives that his culture sets before him. Whether these goals are the kinds of proximate goals which relate to his specific role as an individual

[1]David S. Hoopes and Gary L. Althen, "Culture and Communication in Intercultural Relations," in David S. Hoopes, ed., *Readings in Intercultural Communication* (Pittsburgh, Pa. Regional Council for International Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1971), Vol.I, pp. 21-47

> in a culture—for example, how to make a living or how to raise a family, or to his broader ultimate role in the universe as a whole—the majority of men tend to concur easily with the dominate thinking of the culture of which they are a part. . . . The one-culture person is confined by the goals which his single culture creates for him and more or less requires of him.[2]

Thus, the monocultural person perceives, thinks, values, judges, behaves within his own frame of reference and communicates in the ways of his cultural or subcultural group. Because he perceives and communicates so well and so easily within his own group, only a minimum effort is required to function effectively and he feels comfortable. The implications of the limitations of monoculturality for the social worker are greater than we may at first believe.

Recapitulation of the Project

The project involved both cognitive and affective learning. It aimed at developing biculturality with a predisposition toward multiculturality in the student. The three components of the educational design—the pre-training seminar, experiential field learning with a field seminar in a culture different from one's own, and the integration seminar—were regarded as interacting and essential parts of the whole. Central themes of the pre-training seminar—perception, cultural bias and delimitation, categorization and stereotyping, self-growth and creativity, and biculturality (moving toward multiculturality)—reflected the purpose of broadening perception and provided a theoretical basis for a mental set regarding experiential cultural learning.

The plan for experiential learning in another culture aimed at helping students develop a new style of learning by means of an unstructured situation as well as through culture shock that required ego-involving, affective learning for self-growth and development of creativity. The process was aimed at learning not the specifics of a given culture but at learning to perceive patterns with inner consistency or logic and to understand and respect another way of life rather than to judge it as "bad" or "less good" because it differs from one's own.

This style of learning is applicable to the learning of third and fourth cultures and subcultures, although specifics such as a list of do's and don'ts for a particular culture are deceptive because they give a false sense of "knowing" without an understanding of the other culture's frame of reference and basic philosophy.

Learning cultural patterns involves learning to perceive all that exists in the new culture without the framework of one's own culture. This leads to comprehending the ways of thinking, seeing the world, setting goals, and solving problems as this different set of priorities makes a consistent whole that guides behavior in that culture. The widening of perceptions at this level of learning,

---

[2]John E. Walsh, *Intercultural Education in the Community of Man* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1973), p. 46.

if the initial impact of culture shock is appropriate, shakes up one's values and ways of behaving (since one's customary behavior does not work), and the thrust is toward personal growth and development of one's creativity in discovering alternative approaches in ambiguous as well as known situations. "Breaking the habit," then, leads to the development of conscious awareness of one's own cultural priorities in comparison or contrast, but also relative to the culture one is learning. Taken to its conclusion, the process leads beyond understanding of differences toward the understanding of the relativity of culture.

The integration seminar offered a time and place for group sharing in the process of melding cognitive and affective learning, including identification and conceptualization for use.

Some current authors in culture learning, particularly those with a background of experience (Bochner, Downs, Guthrie, and others), support the view that experiential learning in another culture is essential to what we call an "active" understanding of other cultures. Others (Walsh, for instance) believe that perhaps the goals of intercultural education can be achieved through other approaches. The learning objectives would appear to be a factor. If the objectives are to develop competence in intercultural communication and one's creativity, one way to attain these is through experiential learning in another culture. Thus, one can achieve two goals: gaining an active understanding of other cultures and, in the process, attaining personal growth, including the development of one's creativity in problem-solving. Experiential involvement may be more important for some groups than for others. The experiential level of involvement is especially important for people in the helping professions and for those whom Bochner calls "mediating men."[3] Our concern here is with social workers, but a strong case could be made for experiential programs of study for teachers at all levels of education, public health workers, administrators, engineers, agriculturalists, and so on.

The Students

The students in the Guam groups, at the time of their participation, ranged in age from 24 to 30. All completed the project. Two were of Chinese and three of Japanese-American ancestry; the others were Caucasian. Some were born in Hawaii; some had lived here a year or more, some eight to ten years. Two had had role experience outside the United States; several had traveled in other countries; a few had not been outside Hawaii. Forty percent were women and 60 percent were men. Now graduated for three and two years, all (except one, who is in a temporary job), serve either a multi-ethnic clientele in a social agency, teach multi-ethnic groups of students in educational institutions, or associate with multi-ethnic groups while engaged in doctoral studies. Two students chose to work in other countries for a year before making future

[3]Stephen Bochner, *The Mediating Man: Cultural Interchange and Transnational Education* (Honolulu: East-West Center, 1975).

plans; at least one student has changed jobs to a milieu which has less security but which gives freedom to explore and experiment; another works only with people from other cultures. One student is planning to marry into and live and work in another culture; two have married into their own cultural groups, but one has married a person quite different from earlier associations.

Two students in the Molokai variation were of Japanese-American ancestry, the other three were Caucasians. Of this recently graduated group, most work in a multi-ethnic milieu in social service or related agencies; one is continuing advanced study.

The five Chinese students in the first year of the Hong Kong program have recently graduated. Follow-up information is not yet available on this group.

Limitations of the Project

Certain limitations of the project should be noted. The sample of students involved admittedly is small and was already a selected group engaged in graduate professional study. The data are largely unstructured verbatim reports and records. They include the students' free-flowing daily records of thinking and feeling, of reactions, responses, and experiences while they were occurring. They include tapes of the field seminar sessions, showing the group interaction during the experience, as well as tapes from the integration seminar sessions. They also include two sets of self-evaluation summaries, the first prepared one month after the field experience and the other some months after completion of the integration seminar and just prior to graduation. The summaries were also free-flowing, the only instruction being to cover problems as well as satisfactions in the learning regarding culture and aspects of personal growth. Additional data from recent informal conversations with about 80 percent of the students have been used. The Hong Kong program provides another set of data.

The decision not to use a schedule or questionnaire approach was deliberate. Freedom and creativity do not lend themselves to quantitative measurement. Throughout, we sought to avoid both closure and any imposed framework or expectations with respect to learning other than the broad objectives and the pre-training. Initially, the non-prescriptive nature of our answers to some of the students' questions about expectations was a source of frustration, but the frustration subsided as the students began to understand the project. It could be argued that the students felt constraints in writing their journals and summaries because of anxiety about grades in this unconventional program of study, but, based on our prolonged association with the students, it does not appear that their writing and discussions were insincere.

To impose the framework required for quantitative measurement might have resulted in obscuring or losing important qualitative data concerning the changes that had taken place in such a small sample. For our purposes, our open-ended data have provided some insights, revealed strengths in the educational design of the program, suggested some implications for social work education, and generated ideas about what it is really important to explore fur-

ther. Only in this way for instance, could we have understood the depth and nature of the frustration and the range and nature of the growth associated with having no role. The positive function of anxiety in learning was more clearly revealed in the flow of reactions to having no role, which forced the students to learn to relate to people as equals and to learn their framework. If we had not had the advantage of free-flowing data we would not have obtained some of the insights with respect to learning that emerged from the Molokai program, nor could we have documented so convincingly the contributing factors in the stages and time periods of the learning process in the field, as well as the types of change that took place.

Overview of the Outcome

In order to understand student learning outcome it is necessary to understand what actually happened in the interpersonal processes between the students and the people in the new culture. The outcome is highly dependent on achievement of successful interpersonal relationships. As such relationships developed, the students achieved an active understanding of the people in the context of their cultural systems. The process of what happened has been detailed in Chapter IV; the changes as learning outcomes have been detailed in Chapter V. Here, an overview is given.

Several interrelated questions are appropriate: What has endured and been incorporated by the students? In what respects, if any, have the students continued to develop toward bi- and multi-culturality over the three years since the first group and the two years since the second group went to Guam? Have cognitive and affective learning been shaped and organized into relatively stable, enduring developmental attainments that can be identified by the graduates?

The assumption was made that the extent and nature of changes that took place in the students would be identifiable in the journals and tapes of the field seminar sessions and that outcomes would be identified later in the summaries and the integration seminar, and still later in follow-up discussions. The point has been made throughout that there were variations among the students in the extent and degree of learning. At the same time, there were basic consistencies among all students and it is those areas of consistency that are reviewed here.

Outcomes in communication were central to the purpose of the project. The students learned very quickly that their customary modes in *interpersonal relations* did not work, and they were forced to explore and discover new ways. As they began to break away from their selectivity in perception they began to notice what they had missed at first. They learned to listen for what they could not hear before, learned that their questions and comments had a different meaning to the Guamanians than to themselves. They explored some of the cultural systems in which they tried hard to penetrate the values and meaning, such systems as work, play, time, space, social structures, including the family, church, and village. With new perceptions of their values, patterns,

expectations, and behavior they developed a different perspective, not only on their own but on Guamanian systems. A respect and appreciation for, as well as an interest in, difference replaced what had earlier produced negative reactions, isolation, and even a sense of fear and dread. The students began to discover that they were genuinely interested in the people, and enjoyed them. They spoke of having a new appreciation of people who were different from them; an active realization and attitude that others are "as good as I am," are interesting to know, and equal though different. While many people express this attitude in words, the students felt that much of it was just talk. As a result of the project, however, they felt that they carried within themselves the ability to be non-judgmental and to care about people who are different from them. A number of students discovered that their friendships had an enduring quality.

For most students, the relationships they made were warm, caring, and much appreciated. Even those students who still felt some discomfort in relationships at the end of the field experience later reported increased comfort and skill as they continued through their practicum the next year and in practice after that.

Out of this intense learning process the students developed new perceptions as well as an open-mindedness that was freeing. There was conviction now that there are a number of equally good ways of doing things—they had tried others and been successful. The "one way you have known may not always be the best," and "you can risk a search for others."

Understanding and learning ways to *communicate* was demanding and exhausting, but the students considered it "new and valuable learning." Because they did not understand the cultural systems in context, verbal communication was difficult at first (even without much of a language barrier), but non-verbal communication requires finer skills of discrimination and it was fairly late in the field period that students became aware of this, usually through an unsatisfying experience. They became acutely aware that there are many subtle cues by which people send messages to one another, messages of which the outsider is unaware. Although they did not develop skill in identifying the cues—and, in fact, were not able to identify their own non-verbal systems—they did develop a conviction that the meaning of a message is derived from the entire context in which it is sent or received and that more important communication occurs through timbre of the voice, the tone, inflection, and countless non-verbal cues than by actual words.

Most students learned at the level of active understanding that forms of communication are different from culture to culture and vary in subcultures. For example, indirect communication is important where smooth interpersonal relations are valued; direct confrontation tended to be an American approach. Different non-verbal forms were understood non-consciously within the group but not by outsiders.

This learning of subleties in communication had a significant impact on the students. Almost every student expressed an awareness of a qualitative change

in the ability to communicate with people in other cultures as well as in his own; however, two noted that they were not yet as comfortable as they would like to be.

Attention was given in the field learning to both verbal and non-verbal communication. After the field learning, the students spoke of the connectedness of the various cultural systems. They could see that in direct communication activities with individuals, families, or groups, or in activities on their behalf (such as planning, policy, program development), active understanding of all the cultural systems—time, space, work, government, the supernatural, family, and so on—is essential to realistic communication, that communication involves understanding and interpretation of the values, needs, and behavior of others in their cultural or subcultural frame of reference. Later, the students recognized the seriousness of misunderstandings and the conflicts that can occur from these, and they acted on the basis of their learning. In a recent follow-up conversation, several students mentioned that they had learned more about themselves, people, and communication in this project than in all the rest of their professional education.

Turning now to outcomes in *personal growth*, every participant spoke of having a new *confidence* in himself. They spoke of having more confidence in what they feel they can do, in their latent and newly developed capacities, in their ability to find a way out of difficult situations, and in a willingness to take risks that earlier they would not have considered. The basis of their sense of self-esteem was broadened. They were challenged by, rather than fearful or negative toward, difference—they had a broadened basis for understanding people as individuals. A new *tolerance for ambiguity* was expressed as being more relaxed in meeting uncertain situations and experiencing less discomfort when they did not have the answers. Ridding themselves of some compulsive habits in their daily living also indicated increased *flexibility*.

In recent conversations, some participants mentioned a strengthening of the *habit of seeking alternative meanings* and interpretations of a situation, of no longer blindly applying the theory taught in school but of exploring different possible interpretations and approaches. A majority mentioned that instead of looking first for the cause of a problem in the individual personality, they now look at the situation, think in the context of the culture, and go on from there.

In these same conversations, a change in *general outlook* was both implicit and explicit. Participants think about Guam and their friends there. They talk about them. They pay attention to news about Guam, seeing it now as a part of the Pacific. They are more alert to other cultures. Some have moved from an emphasis on monocultural personal association groups to multicultural groups "because they are more stimulating." Often the change was expressed in general terms as an overall awareness and a wider range of interest.

These outcomes are substantial; more important, they are open-ended so far as learning is concerned. Discovery is a pleasure. Risking in order to discover is a challenge. The students have opened significant doors for their further

development.

The overall learning and the outcomes support our initial assumption that the process of learning a new culture by having to cope with ambiguities would lead on the one hand to broader cross-cultural perspective and on the other hand to increased open-mindedness, flexibility, and creativity.

An overview of the Molokai variation cannot be included here because the time since graduation is very short. We believe, however, that this situation—which did not provide adequate culture shock effect and did not demand a level of ego involvement equal to that of the Guam experience—appeared to deter learning. The enduring learning outcomes are not yet clear. Allowing for a "sleeper" effect, a follow-up with the participants in another year may shed some light.

The Hong Kong group will be followed up at graduation and a year later. The demands, although not quite so rigorous as in Guam, were far greater than for the Molokai group. If qualitative differences in outcome can be distinguished, they will provide clues that could lead to refinements in the program.

The kind of anxiety that appears to accompany being part of something unknown and unconventional was expressed by all sets of students—whether in Guam, Molokai, or Hong Kong—from time to time during the pre-training seminar and reappeared briefly early in the field experience in relation to what they wrote in their journals. It was not serious.

The Guam and Hong Kong students experienced brief periods of disorientation upon return home from the field experience, a phenomenon reported in the literature on culture learning. For one student, the period of disorientation was longer.

Suggested Modifications in the Design

Periodically, the students were asked (actually, they tended to express themselves without being asked) to evaluate the approach, the arrangements, and the content of the parts of the training program. They did not all always agree. Near the end of the integration seminar we reviewed their earlier comments, questions, and suggestions in retrospect. The general outcomes of this review follow.

Pre-training

The 14-week term seemed to both students and instructors a long preparatory time span. The students also felt that discussions were often just moving into new depths when the class period ended. They also expressed a desire to have some exercises that would help "make things stick," as they thought that this might accelerate their field learning. (Trifonovitch,[4] Downs,[5] and

---

[4]Gregory J. Trifonovitch, "On Cross-Cultural Orientation Techniques," *Topics in Culture Learning*, Vol. I (August, 1973), pp. 38-47.

[5]James F. Downs, "Fables, Fancies and Failures in Cross-Cultural Training," *Trends* (Hilo, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Peace Corps Training Program), Vol. 2, No. 3 (1969).

others have developed and used successfully a variety of cross-cultural orientation techniques.) Two modifications, then, were suggested for the pretraining: (1) developing within various theme areas some exercises and assignments that would give students an opportunity to grasp theory in real-life situations, and (2) concentrating the learning into a shorter time span for three/four hours weekly.

These suggestions proved useful when developing the University of Hong Kong variation.

Field Learning

The eight-week time span was largely arbitrary. For practical reasons, it could not be longer; in relation to its objectives, we felt it could not be shorter. Students felt, both toward the end and in retrospect, that some additional time would have been better. Some thought a month, others said several weeks. The eight-week period was too short for the students to believe they had grasped the patterning of Guamanian ideas, beliefs, values, etc., in their total behavioral context. They did learn the significance of this knowledge, however, and used this recognition in their later work.

In Guam, the students had to develop their own learning opportunities and were regularly involved with families, groups, and individuals for a part of each day, but they were also required to relate to a variety of people from other cultures while in the dormitories. These arrangements were not feasible in Molokai. Arrangements for the Hong Kong students were similar to those in Guam. The outcome suggests that the requirement to develop their own learning opportunities, plus a variety of interaction situations such as were available in Guam and Hong Kong, is preferable to the pre-arranged one-family plan in Molokai.

The site of the field learning can be anywhere but, on the basis of our Molokai variation, we believe the site should meet at least the following conditions:

(1) The culture should be sufficiently different from one's own so that culture shock is experienced (this might mean a non-industrialized culture).
(2) The site should be away from one's own home.
(3) The arrangements should provide opportunity for students to develop their own contacts with a variety of families, groups, and individuals.
(4) The living situation should require students to relate to a variety of people. Living with a family is seen as restrictive to learning in the sense that students are likely to be treated as guests. Spending a few days with a family is encouraged, if appropriate and natural.

Integration Seminar

Clearly the integration seminar was important for clarification and developing new insights and interpretations and as a means of helping students to conceptualize and consolidate their learning. Perhaps more guidance and a few selected readings in culture learning would have helped students go even farther. The students were not explicit on this point, but this is the impression of the instructors.

The time span of the integration seminar might be shortened in somewhat the same way as suggested for the pre-training, and for similar reasons. One experience with a shortened span and longer sessions appeared to be effective.

Implications for Professional Education in Social Work

A compelling reason for undertaking this project was an attempt to find approaches to overcome the problems created by the preponderance of monoculturalism among members of the helping professions. We were convinced that the problem would not yield to conventional approaches, and, despite increased intercultural orientation in higher education, relatively little emphasis has been placed on developing an active understanding of other cultures or subcultures. Recent conversations with graduates who participated in this project confirm the fact that most of them consider it the most worthwhile learning experience in their social work education, an evaluation that should be taken seriously by educators.

In our view, the project outcomes (Chapter V) suggest social work education might find the following changes of benefit: (1) changes in emphasis of certain learning objectives in social work education; (2) some fundamental change in the curriculum model(s) of social work education; and (3) new types of faculty development programs. After a brief discussions of the implications of the outcomes, some specific ideas for change will be developed.

Robert Masuda, a faculty member involved in the third year of the project (Molokai variation),[6] considers that our need to be in control of a situation, our comfort with the known, deters us from moving out to accept uncertainty and to evolve curricula that provide students with the opportunity to develop a capacity to work in ambiguous situations. He asks: What elements are crucial in a social worker's repertoire of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable him to make a sensitive, purposeful input? In his view, the basic element that needs further attention in the curriculum is the student himself: "The effectiveness of a social worker in his professional practice derives largely from his awareness and appreciation of how much of himself he brings into a situation and, simultaneously, how much he is limited by his own cultural experiences and background in his perception, his attitudes, his outlook, his activities." It is the active understanding in contrast to the passive understanding (see Chapter I) that Masuda seeks for students.

Masuda's comments, in the light of his participation in this project, touch on three areas: faculty development, curricula development, and continuing opportunities for students.

With regard to faculty development, Masuda argues for the development of

---

[6]We are greatly indebted to our colleague, Mr. Robert Masuda, for providing some material for this discussion, and for his ideas and new perceptions regarding some aspects of social work education that he attributes to his involvement in the project. The ideas of the students and of the authors are similar to those of Mr. Masuda, although his were developed independently. Mr. Masuda presumably does not carry the biases which the authors may have, and therefore, his comments are especially pertinent here.

divergent thinking in social work educators rather than the "cautiousness that has made us imitative rather than creative in our work with students." He feels social work educators need to move out of the "narrow perspectives of their own beliefs, education, and background," and that broadened perspective is needed with respect to cross-cultural comprehension. He recommends that faculty members should have the same experience that students in this project have had.

Concerning curricula, Masuda points out that present curricula employ relatively little knowledge of people based on their orientation to time, space, work, and the supernatural; their values, feelings about themselves, families, children, and friends; the nature of their network of relationships; and their thoughts about the world. He points out that the knowledge we use is based primarily on psychological, sociological, and sometimes anthropological themes regarding man which are all interpreted within the context of our own cultural perceptions and values rather than the perceptions and values of the people with whom we work. He refers to the use of systems theory to identify the problem as a crucial element in moving toward solution but questions how we can collect data that are meaningful if we do not comprehend the values and priorities of the people with whom and on whose behalf the work is done. Data, he observes, too often are collected on the basis of *our* perception of the problem and *our* categorization of the people rather than in their frame of reference.

With regard to new opportunities for students, Masuda recommends that "a semester, no, a whole year be devoted just to learning another culture, i.e., different from his own, and a practicum in which he works with people from differing cultures or subcultures." He suggests as a general objective in the development of courses, including practicum, the goal of having students develop a pattern of divergent thinking. "Students should continually be asked to look at situations, not only through tested theories, but . . . to find the many options relating to the situation, even if the options are not rationally deduced." He continues, "One thing I gained from my experience in this project is awareness of the endless possibilities . . . available to us in relation to human problem-solving if we learn to think this way." Masuda points out that opening our minds to differing options is an attitude and skill that has not been emphasized sufficiently in education. "Dualism," he says, "which is a prevalent philosophy in our society boxes us into either/or positions. Life is not that way. If we expect to make an impact we need to be open . . . to the vast array of viable solutions available to human beings—often different from our own."

Recommendations

On the basis of the student learning outcomes and Masuda's ideas, some suggestions are now considered.

Masuda thinks it is the *student* to whom special attention should be given. On paper, social work curricula usually include "development of creativity"

as a student learning objective. What does it mean to a faculty? Who takes responsibility for it? How is it accomplished? Is it recognized as an objective for which special learning opportunities must be provided? Perhaps, as with values, we say "this is an objective of all courses, of the total curriculum." But, as an objective, the development of creativity involves a point of view about learning which our curricula lack and which, in fact, may unwittingly deter. Education tends to value convergent thinking—this is the theory, this is the way—rather than divergent thinking—a discovery of alternative ways. This possible contradiction between an objective and the reality of curricula is significant in terms of professional development and practice as well. Students have said, "You beat the creativity out of us" and they may be right.

If social work educators are convinced that an essential component of professional practice lies in the creativity of the social worker, then learning a new style of learning as documented here merits active consideration. Thus, an objective that is always included on paper because we feel we should give lip service to it but to which, in actuality, we give little priority would move to a position of high priority and conscious attention. This change would, however, involve different approaches in both class and field instruction (or practicum). Emphasis then would be on the development of creativity through a different style of learning which would challenge students to seek alternative approaches and solutions to problems and would prepare them to work more adequately in a milieu of uncertainty.

This is an era of educational models and, on the basis of our experience and student learning outcomes, we venture to suggest yet another curriculum model—*a culture model*. A culture model would lift the profession into a world perspective. In our view, it could transcend existing limitations in communication between groups and, because it would demand cross-cultural learning, could be a first step in breaking down the barriers that exist between cultural and subcultural groups.

Unifying themes of the background knowledge sequences (human behavior and policy, programs, and services) would be developed in the context of culture. The learning expectations would be different; the content would be modified and placed in a different context; teaching approaches would change; assignments would be different.

Human behavior courses would be organized in a culture context. Individual variation or personality would be seen within this frame of reference. And, hopefully, theories of personality which are developed usually in relation to a given period, a given social structure and cultural environment, would be understood as part of a larger whole and used comparatively to examine their cross-cultural or subcultural validity. Students would then have a broad frame of reference from which to seek appropriate approaches and solutions to problems, whether at individual or group levels and within a culture or subculture or across cultures.

With culture as a unifying theme, the policy, programs, and services sequence (or social welfare, or whatever title is given) would be organized within

the matrix of cultural systems. Through comparative cultural and cross-cultural study, students would seek, as in the human behavior sequence, appropriate approaches and solutions to conditions or problems.

Culture as a unifying theme would call for modifications also in the approach used in methods or practice courses. The practicum, at some point prior to the second year, would be modified to provide an unstructured experience in culture learning in which the student would be required to create his own milieu, generate his own learning, and have an opportunity to develop and use skills for active cross-cultural understanding. The specific aspects of professional skills could follow. Such a change in practicum would involve a different type of field teaching—less comfortable at first—and thus field teachers or supervisors, like classroom teachers, would be involved in a faculty learning program.

Perhaps a few schools who would be interested in a curriculum endeavor of this kind might associate as a working group. Funds might be sought from international or national organizations to provide an opportunity for members of the faculties to meet at periodic intervals to hammer out curricula and develop a plan to evaluate student learning outcomes at graduation and later. Some protracted interchange with individuals from other disciplines, such as social psychology would be especially helpful, but these should, in our view, be individuals who have not only cross-cultural experience but are bi- or multi-cultural in the sense of having achieved an active understanding of culture as described in previous chapters. Some individuals who are or have been actively involved in culture learning programs should have a contribution to make. Perhaps some schools in different cultures could engage in relevant aspects of cross-cultural research.

Changes such as those suggested challenge long-held values and are bound to be resisted. For those who have a commitment to the future and are willing to take risks, there will be rewards.

Some of the changes call for a shaking up of our previous learning and way of learning. A tour of study or of teaching does not *ipso facto* involve people in gut-level culture learning. It is anticipated that *social work educators* will discover that they, too, will profit by engaging in a learning process similar to that of this project. As a matter of fact, this is what participating students recommended!

We hope this book will stimulate not only social work educators but also educators in other professions, both in the United States and other countries, to develop curricula that will produce graduates with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills for work with people of all cultures and subcultures in a future that holds, as always, the constant of uncertainty.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Peter S. "The Transitional Experience: An Alternative View of Culture Shock," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Vol. 15, No. 14, pp. 13-23.

Adorno, Theodor W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, and Nevitt Sanford. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.

Al-Issa, Ihsan, and Wayne Dennis (eds.). *Cross-Cultural Studies of Behavior*. New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Allport, G. W. and T. F. Pettigrew. "Cultural Influence on the Perception of Movement: The Trapezoidal Illusion Among the Zulus," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 104-113.

Aptekar, Herbert H. "The Values, Functions, and Methods of Social Work: An Interpretive Report of the Honolulu Seminar," in *An Intercultural Exploration: Universals and Differences in Social Work Values, Functions, and Practice*. Report of the Inter-Cultural Seminar, the East-West Center, Hawaii. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1967.

Berry, John W. and Jules Leroux (eds.) *Directory of Cross-Cultural Research*. Bellingham, Wash.: Department of Psychology, Western Washington State College, 1973.

Bloodworth, Dennis. *The Chinese Looking Glass*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1967.

Bochner, Stephen. "Cultural Filters," *Culture and Language Learning Newsletter*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1975.

———. "The House Form as a Cornerstone of Culture," in *Topics in Culture Learning*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1975.

———. *The Mediating Man: Cultural Interchange and Transnational Education*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1973.

Boucher, Jerry D. "Faces, Feelings and Culture," *Culture and Language Learning Newsletter*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1974.

Brein, M. and K. David. "Intercultural Communication and the Adjustment of the Sojourner," *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 76, No. 3 (1971), pp. 215-230.

Brislin, Richard W. and Paul Pederson. *Cross-Cultural Orientation Programs*. New York: Gardner Press, Inc., 1976.

Brislin, Richard W., Stephen Bochner, and Walter J. Lonner (eds.). *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Learning*. Beverley Hills and New York: SAGE and Wiley/Halsted, 1975.

Brown, Roger W. "Language and Categories," in Jerome S. Bruner, J. J. Goodnow, and G. A. Austin (eds.). *A Study of Thinking*. New York: John Wiley, 1956. Pp. 247-312.

———. *Words and Things*. Illinois: Free Press, 1958.

Bruner, Jerome S. *The Process of Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

———, J. J. Goodnow, and G. A. Austin. *A Study of Thinking*. New York: John Wiley, 1956.

———, "Social Psychology and Perception," in E.E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (eds.). *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, third edition, 1958. Pp. 85-94.

Carano, Paul and Pedro C. Sanchez. *A Complete History of Guam*. Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1961.

Chobot, Neal. "Phenomenology and Intercultural Understanding," *Working Paper No. 6*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1971.

Cleveland, Harlan, Gerard J. Mangone, and John Clarke Adams. *The Overseas Americans*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.

Coates, Austin. *Islands of the South*. London: Heinemann Educational Books, Ltd., 1974.

Coelho, George V. "Personal Growth and Educational Development Through Working and Studying Abroad," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (1962), pp. 55-67.

Cole, Michael. "An Ethnographic Psychology of Cognition," in Richard W. Brislin, Stephen Bochner, and Walter J. Lonner (eds.). *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Learning*. Beverley Hills and New York: SAGE and Wiley/Halsted, 1975.

———, J. Gay, J. Glick, and D. Sharp. *The Cultural Context of Learning and Thinking*. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

———, and Sylvia Scribner. *Culture and Thought*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1974.

Combs, Arthur W. "Intelligence From a Perceptual Point of View," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 47 (1952), pp. 662-673.

Crocombe, R. G. *The New South Pacific*. Wellington: Reed Education, Division of A. H. and A. W. Reed, Ltd., 1973.

Culture and Language Learning Newsletter. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center. Issued periodically.

Downs, James F. "Understanding Culture: Guidelines and Techniques for Training," *Trends*, Vol. 3, No. 2. Hilo, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Peace Corps Training Program,

———. "Fables, Fancies and Failures in Cross-Cultural Training, " *Trends*, Vol. 2, No. 3, Hilo, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Peace Corps Traininng Program, 1969.

Draguns, Juris G. "Resocialization into Culture: The Complexities of Taking a Worldwide View of Psychotherapy," in Richard W. Brislin, Stephen Bochner, and Walter J. Lonner (eds.). *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Learning*. Beverley Hills and New York: SAGE and Wiley/Halsted, 1975.

Fast, Julius. *Body Language*. New York: M. Evans & Co., Inc., 1970.

Foa, Uriel G. and Martin M. Chemers, "The Significance of Role Behavior Differentiation for Cross-Cultural Interaction Training," *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1967), pp. 45-57.

Fuchs, Lawrence H. *Those Peculiar Americans*. New York: Meredith Press, 1967.

Getzels, Jacob W. and Philip W. Jackson. *Creativity and Intelligence: Explorations with Gifted Students*. New York: John Wiley, 1962.

———. *Metamorphosis: On the Development of Affect, Perception, Attention, and Memory*. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Gibson, J. J. *The Senses Considered as Perceptual Systems*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Griffin, Willis H. "International Educational Cooperation and the World's Future," *Topics in Culture Learning*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1975.

Guilford, J. Paul. *Personality*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Gullahorn, Jeanne E. and John T. Gullahorn, "American Students Abroad: Professional vs. Personal Development," *The Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science*, No. 368 (1966), November, pp. 43-59.

Gullahorn, John T. and Jeanne E. "An Extension of the U-Curve Hypothesis," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (1963), pp. 33-47.

Guthrie, George M. "A Behavioral Analysis of Culture Learning," in Richard Brislin, Stephen Bochner, and Walter J. Lonner (eds.). *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Learning*. Beverly Hills and New York: SAGE and Wiley/Halsted, 1975.

Hall, Edward T. *The Hidden Dimension*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966.

———. *The Silent Language*. New York: Fawcett World Library, 1959.

——— and William Foote Whyte. "Intercultural Communication: A Guide of Men of Action," *Human Organization*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (1960), pp. 5-12.

Harrison, Roger and Richard L. Hopkins. "The Design of Cross-Cultural Training: An Alternative to the University Model," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (1967), pp. 431-460.

Henle, Paul (ed.). *Language, Thought, and Culture*. Ann Arbor: University Of Michigan Press, 1958. Chapter I.

Hoopes, David S. (ed.). *Readings in Intercultural Communication*. 3 vols. Pittsburgh: Regional Council for International Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

——— and Gary L. Althen, "Culture and Communication in Intercultural Communication," in Hoopes, David S. (ed.). *Readings in Intercultural Communication*. Vol. I. Pittsburgh: Regional Council for International Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

Hudson, W. "Pictorial Depth Perception in Sub-Cultural Groups in Africa," *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 52 (November, 1960), pp. 183-208.

Kleinjans, Everett, "Cross-Cultural Linguistic Communication," *Working Paper No. 12*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1972.

———. "On Culture Learning," *Working Paper No. 13*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1972.

Krathwohl, David R., Benjamin S. Bloom and Bertram S. Masia. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1956.

Lambert, Wallace E. *Language, Psychology, and Culture*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1972.

Lambo, T., "The Importance of Cultural Factors in Psychiatric Treatment," *Acta Psychiatric Scandinavia*, Vol. 38 (1962), pp. 176-179.

Lee, Dorothy, "Are Basic Needs Ultimate?" in Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray (eds.). *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2nd edition, revised, 1953.

———. "Some Implications of Culture for Interpersonal Relations," *Social Casework*, Vol. 31, No. 9 (November, 1950), pp. 355-360.

Liberman, A. M., Katherine S. Harris, H. S. Hoffman, and B. P. Griffith. "The Discrimination of Speech Sounds Within and Across Phoneme Boundaries," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, Vol. 54 (1957), pp. 358-368.

Lippitt, Ronald and Jeanne Watson. "Some Special Problems of Learning and Teaching Process in Cross-Cultural Education," *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 11 (1955), pp. 59-65.

Lysgaard, Sverre, "Adjustment in a Foreign Society: Norwegian Fulbright Grantees Visiting the United States," *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (1955), pp. 45-51.

Maretzki, Thomas W. "Transcultural Adjustment of Peace Corps Volunteers," in Joseph C. Finney (ed.). *Culture Change, Mental Health, and Poverty*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1969.

Maslow, Abraham. "Defense and Growth," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1956), pp. 36-47.

Miner, Horace. "Body Ritual Among the Nacirema," *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (1956), pp. 503-507.

Morris, R. T. *The Two-Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Students' Adjustment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1960.

Niyekawa, Agnes M. *A Study of Second Language Learning—The Influence of First Language on Perception, Cognition and Second Language Learning: A Test of the Whorfian Hypothesis*. Final Report, April 1968, University of Hawaii, Project No. 3260, Contract No. OE-6-10-308, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (ERIC ED #024026).

Niyekawa-Howard, Agnes M. "The Current Status of the Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis," *Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (1972), pp. 1-30. Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawaii.

———. "Biculturality and Cognitive Growth: Theoretical Foundations for Basic and Applied Research," *Working Paper No. 1*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1970.

Novak, Michael. *The Experience of Nothingness*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Price-Williams, Douglas R. (ed.). *Cross-Cultural Studies: Selected Readings*. New York: Penguin Books, 1969.

Rokeach, Milton. *The Open and Closed Mind: Investigations into the Nature of Belief Systems and Personality Systems*. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Sanders, Irwin T. *Professional Education for World Responsibility*. New York: Educational and World Affairs, 1968.

———. *The Professional School and World Affairs*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1967.

——— and Jennifer C. Ward. *Bridges to Understanding*. New York: McGraw-Hill (for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education), 1970.

Sanford, Nevitt. *Self and Society*. New York: Atherton Press, 1966.

Segall, M. H., D. T. Campbell, and M. J. Herskovits. *The Influence of Culture on Visual Perception*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Singer, Michael, "Culture: A Perceptual Approach," in David Hoopes (ed.). *Readings in Intercultural Communication*. Vol. I. Pittsburgh: Regional Council for International Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

Smith, Alfred G. *Communication and Culture*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Stewart, Edward C. *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Dimensions of International Education, No. 3. Pittsburgh: Regional Council for International Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1972.

Tagiuri, Renato. "Person Perception," in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.). *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 2nd edition, 1969.

Taylor, Harold. *The World as Teacher*. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1969.

Textor, Robert B. (ed.). *Cultural Frontiers of the Peace Corps*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Thompson, Laura. *Guam and Its People*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947.

Topics in Culture Learning. Published annually since 1973. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center.

Triandis, Harry C. *The Analysis of Subjective Culture*. New York: John Wiley, 1972.

———. "Culture Training Cognitive Complexity and Interpersonal Attitudes," in Richard W. Brislin, Stephen Bochner, and Walter J. Lonner (eds.). *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Learning*. Beverley Hills and New York: SAGE and Wiley/Halsted, 1975.

Trifonovitch, Gregory J. "On Cross-Cultural Orientation Techniques," in *Topics in Culture Learning*. Honolulu: Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, 1973.

Useem, John and Ruth H. *The Western Educated Man in India: A Study of His Social Roles and Influence*. New York: Dryden Press, 1955.

Vassiliou, Vasso G. and George Vassiliou, "The Implicative Meaning of the Greek Concept of Philotomo," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1973), pp. 326-341.

Walsh, John E. *Intercultural Education in the Community of Man*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1973.

Watson, Jeanne and Ronald Lippitt. *Learning Across Cultures: A Study of Germans Visiting America*. Ann Arbor: Research Center for Group Dynamics. Institite for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1955.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee. "Language and Stereotypes," in E.E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley. *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, third edition, 1958.

Wight, Albert R. *Cross-Cultural and Community Training: A Draft Handbook* (Prepared for the Peace Corps). Estes Park, Colorado: Center for Research and Education, 1969.

Wofford, Harris. "The Future of the Peace Corps," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, No. 365 (May, 1960), pp. 129-145.